

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Christian Church owes an incalculable debt to the Jew. She cannot, or at least she ought not, to forget that Jesus was a Jew, that salvation is of the Jews, and that considerably more than one-half of her Sacred Scriptures is Jewish literature. This obvious debt has indeed time and again been rankly and gratefully acknowledged. 'Let us remember,' said Lyman Abbott, 'that all that we have and all that we are we owe, under God, to what Judaism has given us.' And Matthew Arnold, better known still, maintained, with all history in his favour, that 'so long as the world lasts all who want to make progress in righteousness will come to Israel for inspiration, as to the people who have had the sense for righteousness most glowing and strongest.'

But, familiar as is the Old Testament, in theory at least, to Christian people, they know little of the Jewish literature, rich alike in poetry and in prose, which was created in the centuries between the Old Testament and our own day. Names like Solomon Ibn Gabirol, Yehudah Halevi, or Maimonides are fraught with no associations for Christian folk. The Talmud is even spoken of in terms of mild derision by those who never read a line of it; and the long tragic history of expulsions, pogroms, and tortures of body, mind, and spirit, is a sealed letter.

A book well calculated to dispel this ignorance of what the Jew has been and done in history, and

especially in the world of religious thought, is *The Book of Jewish Thoughts*, Selected and Arranged by the Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. HERTZ (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). This anthology, embodying some of 'the imperishable wealth of Israel's heritage,' cannot fail to be a delight and an inspiration to others than the Jewish readers for whom it was primarily written.

Here we can follow the sayings of those who fought and suffered during the long centuries from the days of the Maccabees and even earlier—for the Old Testament is freely quoted—right down to our own day, for it includes words by Israel Zangwill, Mr. C. G. Montefiore, the Chief Rabbi himself, and others. The Apocrypha is drawn upon, and mediæval and later poetry is presented in poetical translations not unworthy of the original. A few historical anecdotes well illustrate the unconquerable spirit of the people. Here is one. In 1089, after celebrating the Passover, a Jewish home in Tiberias was attacked and set on fire by the Crusaders. Unmoved, the father, after quoting the sublime assurance of Job (19^{25f.}), began the Song of the Three Children in the fire, 'and when they came to the words, "O thank the Lord, for He is good, and His mercy endureth for ever," their voices were choked, and they ended their days like the Maccabees.' A people like that can never die.

One of the modern writers quoted happily compares them to the Gulf Stream, 'which, passing

through the vast Atlantic Ocean, part of it and yet distinct from it, never losing its individuality but always detected by its deeper colour and warmer temperature, until it eventually modifies the severe climate of a distant country: so Judaism, passing through all the nations of the old world, part of them and yet distinct from them, ever recognized by its depth and intensity, has at last reached this new world'—America—'without having lost its individuality.' All through his history the Jew has shown a remarkable power of adapting and assimilating whatever was valuable in the diverse civilizations into which he wandered, without forfeiting his own distinctiveness.

This cosmopolitan outlook, to which we called attention last month in discussing Kohler's 'Studies and Addresses,' characterizes many of the 'thoughts' quoted by Dr. HERTZ. One of the Masters, we are reminded by the Talmud, pointed to Gn 5¹ as the greatest verse in the Bible; 'This is the book of the generations of man'—not black, not white, not great, not small, but *man*. Again, there is the well-known word that 'the righteous of all nations shall have part in the rewards of the future world.' And only a generous heart could have uttered this thought, 'Be the first to extend courteous greeting to every one, whatever be his faith; provoke not to wrath one of another belief than thine.' We hear so much of Jewish particularism that it is well to remember that there is also a Jewish universalism, present not only in the nobler reaches of the Old Testament, but also in the later centuries, when the Jew had little reason to look with friendliness on the men of another faith who filled his life with misery.

The Jews have been great as physicians, financiers, and philosophers, but most of all have they been great as 'witnesses'—to use Deutero-Isaiah's word (43¹² 44⁸)—to the eternal God. That has been their historic mission. And, though scattered to the four winds of heaven, they have, with almost incredible tenacity, preserved their religious distinctiveness, largely by their love of the Bible, the Home, and the Sabbath. From the Maccabean days, when it was death to possess a copy of the

Torah, they have cherished for it a no less than passionate devotion. 'A feeling of holy joy writes Joseph Jacobs in 1889, 'is diffused throughout the humblest Hebrew home by the solemn repetition of acts which in themselves may be regarded as mere customs, without vital connexion with the souls of men.' And most characteristic of all such institutions is the Sabbath, which for the Jew is a day of profound and peculiar happiness. As Achad Ha'am has well said, 'Far more than Israel has kept the Sabbath, it is the Sabbath that has kept Israel.'

The devotional section of Dr. HERTZ's book includes many beautiful prayers. One of the most suggestive runs thus: 'May it be Thy will, O God, that we return to Thee in perfect penitence, so that we may not be ashamed to meet our Father in the life to come.'

The section entitled 'The Voice of Wisdom' is full of good things, recalling that mastery of life and that shrewdness and insight into its meanings which is so characteristic of the Wisdom Books of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. Let the following quotations suffice: 'A jester may be first in the kingdom of heaven, if disinterestedly he has diminished the sadness of human lives.' 'A man should so live that at the close of every day he can repeat, "I have not wasted my day." 'It is so delightful to pity ourselves, to yield to the "luxury of woe," and sing a plaintive song of self-commiseration in a minor key. But the next step is to give your soul to the devil. Judaism is not more emphatic against the latter than the former.' That is from Mr. I. Abrahams in 1893, and in the same year comes this from Mr. C. C. Montefiore, 'The contemplation of death should plant within the soul elevation and peace. Above all, it should make us see things in their true light. For all things which seem foolish in the light of death are really foolish in themselves.' These maxims are in the true succession of the old Wisdom writers.

May one quotation more be permitted from this anthology of generous and inspiring thoughts

When the Egyptian hosts were drowning in the Red Sea, the angels in heaven were about to break forth in songs of jubilation. But the Holy One, blessed be He, silenced them with the words: "My creatures are perishing, and ye are ready to sing!" This is from the Talmud; let us not think unkindly of the Talmud any more.

We do not wonder that this fine anthology, which can only enhance our admiration for the heroes, saints, and thinkers of the Jewish people, has already run into over one hundred thousand copies. May it long continue to do its good work!

In his recently published book, *Sex, Marriage, and Religion*, the Rev. Alec R. VIDLER handles the vexed question of the Christian attitude to divorce. The present case for divorce, he says, is this: if a husband and wife cease to love one another, and especially if either of them comes to love some one else, then the marriage ceases to have any reality; it becomes a mockery and ought to be declared at an end, because it is in effect already at an end. For marriage is not merely a formal contract; it is a vital union of two personalities. If it is no longer that then it is dead and finished with. His argument, it will be seen, if not conclusive is at least specious.

He then raises and answers four questions: (1) On what grounds has the Christian tradition based its absolute objection to divorce? (2) What is the validity, if any, of these grounds? (3) Has Christianity an alternative remedy for the needs which divorce is designed to meet? and (4) What rational conclusion may we draw on the whole matter? The answer to (1) is very simple: Christ Himself condemned divorce (Mk 10^{2ff.}). It is true that in the parallel passage in Matthew Christ makes an exception in the case of fornication. But surely, Mr. VIDLER says, all competent scholars now agree that the words 'except it be for fornication' are not authentic words of Christ. They are a gloss inserted by the editor of Matthew in order ostensibly to make Christ's meaning

clearer. Christ's attitude, then, is definite, and it is reinforced by the teaching of St. Paul (1 Co 7^{10f. 27}). This has been the explicit Christian tradition on the matter.

What, then, is the validity of this tradition? An objection that looks serious is made on the ground that Christ's teaching is relative. Take two examples. He obviously thought of David as the author of the Psalms, but if there is anything certain, it is that David did not write the 110th Psalm. It is, however, unreasonable to suppose that Christ would anticipate the literary opinions of posterity. Again, He attributed the incidence of certain diseases to demon-possession which modern science describes in a different fashion. These examples show that the teaching of Christ was inevitably conditioned by the time and the locality in which His human life was lived. And so His teaching on certain matters was relative, not absolute. Does this not apply to His teaching about divorce?

No, says Mr. VIDLER. For in the first place Christ's teaching was prophetic, *i.e.* assured and revelational on moral issues. On the other matters—literary criticism and the nature of disease—we are dealing with the mould of His teaching. On moral points we are dealing with its essence. Moreover, in general Christ's teaching lays down principles not laws. He never legislates except on this one matter. And the fact that He went out of His way on this great moral question to legislate, in answer to an appeal for an authoritative judgment, shows how important a matter He considered it, and how essential He thought it to be to make the truth explicit and clear. He says (Mk 10²⁻¹²) that husband and wife are 'one flesh'; God has united them in such a way that no human authority can divide them.

Now observe the significance of this point. The expression 'one flesh' implies the thought of children; in other words, the institution of marriage is based on the idea of family life. What does this mean except that marriage has reference to parent-hood and family life? Marriage has often been

regarded (even by St. Paul!) from the point of view of sex. But this is wrong. Christian ethics and the teaching of Christ unite sex with parenthood indissolubly. There are three reasons for which marriage is said to have been ordained: (1) for the procreation of children, (2) for the satisfaction of the sex instinct, and (3) for comradeship between man and woman. Now if people may marry for any one of these reasons, for example, if marriage is permissible for reason (2), then there seems no ground for refusing divorce because marriage may cease to provide satisfaction for the sex instinct. But if the only true *raison d'être* for marriage is parenthood, then obviously divorce is wrong. And all real experience confirms this rejection of divorce. Indissoluble marriage 'works,' and Christian experience confirms and reinforces the moral insight which led Christ to declare marriage indissoluble.

Now comes the question: Has Christianity a remedy for the evils which divorce is meant to meet? Any remedy for a moral need must be based on an analysis of causes. And when we analyse the causes of unhappy marriages we find that they are of three kinds. One is insufficient preparation for married life. The romantic hope of 'roses, roses all the way' is seldom borne out by life. And what people need is training to realize the meaning, seriousness, problems, and difficulties of family life. Another cause of disaster is the present 'freedom' in habits of courting. The old fashion may have been too reserved; the present fashion is much too lacking in that quality. But the third reason of unhappy marriages is the most serious, because it brings us to 'hard cases.'

Take the case of a young husband with three children whose wife has gone out of her mind without hope of recovery. Or, the case of a young wife married to a rogue, and deserted by him. She has found a real mate worthy of her. In these cases ought not divorce to seem both reasonable and inevitable? Mr. VIDLER is hard pressed here, and can only contend (what is reasonable enough in its way) that such cases are abnormal. He even calls them pathological, and contends that

hard cases make bad laws. The needs of the race and the group have to be paramount. And if we regard the needs of the race we must at all costs, even of hardship in special cases, reject the plea for divorce.

Summing up, then, here are the conclusions he comes to. First, biology teaches that sex is inextricably connected with parenthood; second, history teaches that marriage and the family are the institutions by which the biological purpose of sex and parenthood is secured; third, Christ, the supreme prophet of God, teaches that marriage is indissoluble since parenthood is its purpose; and fourth, the test of experience confirms the teaching of biology, history, and Christ. Is there any alternative to Christian marriage which can stand the test of experience? The results of greater 'freedom' which we see in various quarters do not encourage us to go in that direction. It is reasonable to hope that in the future marriage and family life will survive, and that the present disintegration will be looked back upon as a deplorable historical episode. Such are Mr. VIDLER's conclusions, and, whatever effect they have on the reader's mind, at least the writer has honestly furnished his reader with a statement of both sides of the case in his interesting review.

Discussing the statement, 'I am free to write this discourse,' Hobbes points out that the question is not whether a man can write or forbear, but whether the will to write and the will to forbear come upon him according to his will. In other words, Hobbes distinguishes between free acting and free willing. Freedom of action does not present much difficulty to the philosopher; what has concerned European philosophy since the time of Aristotle is the problem of freedom of will.

This age-long problem is faced by Professor N. O. LOSSKY, who holds the Chair of Philosophy in the Russian University of Prague, in his book, *Freedom of Will* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), which has recently appeared in an English translation. The translator, Natalie Duddington, M.A.,

has succeeded in giving us a clear and readable translation, and we are glad to sample the philosophical views of a thinker whose writings are voluminous and distinguished. And the dedicatory preface engages our sympathies: 'To the Czecho-Slovak people who have enabled me to continue my work in philosophy during the years of exile.'

It is Professor Lossky's opinion, in the maintenance of which he ranges widely over the history of philosophy and often illustrates his points from popular Russian literature, that the truth as between determinism and indeterminism is only to be found in a synthesis of the two which contains a positive conception of freedom. He would call his view 'arbitrarism' (a somewhat misleading title to English ears) rather than indeterminism; and he holds that, as being free from all that is in the world, and even from Him who is above the world, the human self is positively free, or at any rate possesses the positive *form* of freedom.

This formal freedom of the positive sort enables the human self, which is an entity transcending space and time, freely to choose between good and evil, and either to remain a member of the Kingdom of God or to fall away from it. In choosing evil the agent limits his material freedom, that is, his power of doing what he will, but he always retains his formal freedom or the power of choice, and through exercising it aright he may once more enter into a harmonious relation with God and the world.

Professor Lossky operates with a frankly theistic view of the universe, and draws upon Augustine and Thomas Aquinas and other philosophical theologians of the Western Church. While he reacts from the 'supernaturalistic determinism' of Luther, obviously he is far from seeking to revive a Pelagian moralism. It is true that he retains formal freedom, but he also speaks of man's slavery through loss of positive material freedom. And in the endeavour to throw off his bondage and rise out of the Kingdom of enmity man is helped by the gracious power of God.

The following sentences should serve to make Professor Lossky's standpoint clearer: 'Although a fallen being preserves even in his slavery the freedom of willing, he cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven solely by the effort of his will and by the mere decision to do God's will.' 'As the agent ascends the upward path, his power increases, and limitations of his material freedom fall away; and if, on reaching the heights of being, he will prove by his deeds that he has irrevocably chosen the path of the good, he will be found worthy of becoming a member of the Kingdom of God.' 'By voluntarily renouncing, in virtue of his limitless formal freedom, the positive material freedom of the Kingdom of God, the agent dooms himself to a slavish existence in the Kingdom of enmity; by voluntarily renouncing the use of his limitless formal freedom and irrevocably choosing the path of the good, the agent acquires the gracious omnipotence of positive material freedom in God and His Kingdom.'

The Barthian School.

II.

The Theology of Karl Barth.

By PROFESSOR N. W. PORTEOUS, M.A., B.D., ST. ANDREWS.

So much has been written about the theology of Karl Barth in the last few years, and is easily available for those who are interested in the subject, that it is not necessary in the present article to

recapitulate facts which should by this time be well enough known. The studies of Barth's theology by Mr. Birch Hoyle, and in particular by Dr. McConnachie, should be in the hands of every

one who wishes to understand the momentous discussions which are in progress concerning the Christian faith. It will perhaps be more profitable to make use of the available space in an endeavour to state as simply as possible what are the essential things that Barth is trying to say as they appear to one student of his theology. The method adopted may strike some readers as peculiar, but those who have already wrestled with the subject will understand. This article is the first of a series dealing with the outstanding leaders of the so-called Dialectic Theology. In retrospect it should become apparent what are the points of agreement and of difference between Barth and his fellow-workers.

It was said of Hutchison Stirling that he wrote a book called *The Secret of Hegel*, and kept it, and the present writer is quite aware that in endeavouring to expound Barth's theology he is running the risk of incurring a similar taunt. The attempt, however, will have been justified if it encourages any readers of this article who may not yet have faced up to the crucial questions raised by Barth to turn with interest and expectancy to a serious study of the available literature. The Church to-day is suffering from the widespread neglect of theology, and Barth has done us the incalculable service of summoning us once more to the earnest consideration of the big central things of the Christian faith. Whether we ultimately agree with his views or not, that at least must be admitted to his credit.

A statement which Barth himself makes in the preface to the second edition of his Commentary on Romans has frequently and not unnaturally been regarded as furnishing an authentic clue to his theology. 'If I have a "System,"' he there declares, 'it consists in the fact that to the best of my ability I keep steadily before me what Kierkegaard has called the infinite qualitative distinction between time and eternity in its negative and positive significance. God is in heaven and thou upon the earth. The relation of *this* God to *this* man, the relation of *this* man to *this* God is for me the theme of the Bible and the sum of philosophy in one.' In line with this we find him saying in *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (p. 168): 'The impassable frontier of death, the unbridgeable chasm before which we are called to a halt, is the boundary that separates and must separate God from the world, Creator from Creation, the Holy One from sinners, the heavenly idea of the good from all its necessarily fragmentary and infinitely imperfect appearances. Would God be God if He

met us in any other way? Would He be the source of all being and Creator of all things, unless in comparison to Him all being had to be disqualified as not being, and all things recognized as estranged and fallen away from the good and perfect life which belongs to Him alone?' A careful perusal of these passages should make it clear to the reader that an equation is here suggested by Barth between the finitude of the creature and his sinfulness or, to put it otherwise, that sinfulness is included in the definition of man.

Such a view is exposed to obvious criticisms, and it was rightly pointed out that, if that was what Barth meant, then he had no right to consider himself as in the lineal descent of the Protestant Reformers. That his theology has survived such legitimate criticism is the proof that what he had to say was really something quite different, and the fact that he had at first clothed it in inadequate thought-forms did not discourage him from going on saying it.

What Barth realized was that there is a definite barrier between God and man, a barrier which involves a curious disability for man when he tries to speak about God. This is the barrier caused by sin. Now, it is perhaps a not unnatural error to connect this with the obvious distinction between the Creator and that which He has created, a distinction which should, of course, not be lost sight of. But when sinfulness is thus included in the definition of man it ceases to be a subject of serious concern to the practical mind. Sin, as something which ought not to be there, is one thing. Sin, as something which must be there, is another. It must be repeated, however, that Barth has moved beyond this early confused stage in his thinking, and we should be wasting our time if we went on attacking a position which he no longer occupies. No one who has come to realize the tremendous intensity with which Barth holds his fundamental convictions will be inclined to depreciate him seriously for the lack of caution with which he originally expressed them. He saw two things—firstly, that man the created is not the same as God the Creator; and, secondly, that the relation between the Creator and the created has been disturbed by human sin, and he made the mistake of confusing these two things. But they are both true, even though they must be distinguished from each other.

Now, the real question at issue between Barth and those theologians who have really understood him and therefore have the right to disagree with him, relates to the difference which Barth supposes

sin to have made to the relations between God and man. Barth maintains, not that the human mind has become completely incapacitated for all apprehension of the divine will, from all understanding of the divine nature, but that it has through sin become an untrustworthy guide. To base an ethical system on human views of what is right and wrong or to erect a theological structure out of human ideas of God is therefore justified only if we do so with the proviso that we have before us nothing more than a broken reflection of the living God and of His will for men. We see but through a glass darkly. It is right that man should seek to find God both in the actuality of his natural and social environment and in the highest conceptions of human thought: the battle of the realist and the idealist is not a mere shadow-fight, but neither is it a battle which can be finally decided one way or the other. To recognize this fact is to be secured against the temptation of expecting that we should hear God speaking to us unequivocally through Nature and society or through human thought. That He does speak in these ways is not denied. That we misunderstand and misuse what He says is what Barth asserts.

It is not that Barth supposes man to be completely shut up in his own subjectivity. But to admit that Feuerbach was wrong is not to say that the claims made by the natural theologian are right. It is perhaps worthy of mention that, in a letter to the writer, Barth gave it as his opinion that it was in their attitude to this question of the limits of natural theology that the differences between the various representatives of the school of dialectic theology would become most apparent.

Barth, therefore, maintains that it is part of our human duty to take our environment seriously, since it is the environment in which God has set us, and that it is right for us to make the intellectual effort to understand the meaning of human existence and the relation of man to the divine. Only let us do so, he would say, with the proviso that what seems to us to be the noblest reaction to the world may not be obedience towards God, and that our loftiest thoughts may lead us astray from God. We are sinners and therefore cannot claim for our best more than that it is *our* best. How far it corresponds to the divine will or the divine reality is for God to say, not for us.

Barth bases this very radical and, if you like, pessimistic view of human sin not on the ground of what any man has the right to say to himself about human nature, but solely on the verdict passed by God and made known through revelation. The

natural man—and he exists in every one of us—may and should take a very serious view of the wrongness in human nature and in human society, and who would deny that some vision of the beauty of holiness may not haunt him as he does so? Barth, however, means something more than this when he says that man is a sinner and the something more he grounds in special revelation.

But there is something prior to the confession that man is a sinner in this stringent sense of the word which connects it with God's special revelation, and that is the glad conviction that man is a forgiven sinner. It is only the man who is brought to realize that he is under grace who acknowledges that he is under God's judgment. He knows that he is a sinner, but he is a sinner held fast in the hand of God. It is true that Barth at one time tended to proceed from the negative side of the Christian truth about man to the positive side, and laid himself open to the charge that he was producing a positive out of a negative by a mere logical trick. If he ever did so he was wrong. That he now grounds everything in a Word of God which both condemns and forgives, or rather, for these two acts are not in perfect equilibrium, forgives while condemning, is certain, and the recognition that this is so is fundamental to the understanding of Barth's present theological position. If it be true that the mood of the Christian, to borrow an expression of Brunner's, is one of 'comforted despair,' Barth would now underline the 'comforted' more heavily than the 'despair.' But he would not consent to strike out the word 'despair.' Would any one who knows the truth about the Christian life want to do it for him?

What has been said does not mean that the theologian can take this word of forgiveness, which is also judgment, out of God's mouth and say it to the sinner. God alone can say the word, and all that any man can do is to bear witness to the fact that God has said it to him. The real Word of God is not the general statement that God forgives and judges sinners, but that God forgives and judges me, and that is a thing that I can only know when the transaction takes place between God and myself, when faith confesses the justice of the condemnation and rejoices in the knowledge that condemnation does not mean rejection but acceptance.

The Word of God is a thing that is witnessed to—that is how we come to listen for it—but we shall find it more convenient to consider what Barth has to say about the Word itself before considering what he has to say about the human witness to it.

The Word of God comes to man in the form of a command, the command that he should have faith in God, in God's power to free him from the contradiction of human existence, understood, as that must be, as the disabling effect of sin against a holy and loving God. Man is summoned to give up trusting in himself and is invited to accept the status of reconciliation which God is willing to give him. Such faith involves repentance and humility before God.

But how is God's summons to be addressed to man in such a way that his repentance should be tested to the uttermost? It comes to us as Jesus of Nazareth. The Word of God becomes flesh in the most literal way. We are not permitted to slip past Jesus, regarding Him as a symbol for general ideas, the conceiving of which is entirely within our own competence, and which furnishes us with what we feel to be a satisfactory view of God and of His love towards man. We must be content to accept just this Jesus as God's Word. We may see reflections of Him in our general experience. This is not to be wondered at. Are we not God's creation, made in His own image? But what we need is a clue out of the maze in which we find ourselves, and that is what Jesus claims to be. Is this Word not enough if to obey it is not to go astray?

To accept Jesus, however, as such a Word involves the humbling of all our human pride. For Jesus does not come to us as a superman. Much less is He one of whom it could be said that *Deus patet*. He comes to us clothed in His humanity. He comes to us claiming to be the meek and the lowly of heart. He comes to us bearing on hands and feet the print of the nails. He does not even say to us, as if He thought we might, 'Imitate my virtues.' His command is a simple 'Follow me.' And when we inquire what He means by that we discover that it is something quite different from the pious culture of the soul, from moral self-assertion that He would call us to, rather the lowly service of our fellow-men wrought out in the footsteps of Him who came not to be ministered unto but to minister.

God's Word in Jesus, therefore, not only asks for our faith in God's dealings with us, but challenges us to adopt an attitude of love towards our fellows that shall be a reflection of God's love toward us. For the strange thing is that, when God speaks to us in the Incarnate Word, He thereby relates us not only to Jesus but, in one and the same act, to our neighbour. No human face can be so degraded by sin that God may not use it as a means of grace to remind us of the human lineaments of Christ,

and our loyalty to Christ is tested by whether we can say even to the least of Christ's brethren, 'My brother for Jesus' sake.' We cannot serve God in proud, selfish isolation. We serve Him as members of a brotherhood.

We are not entitled, however, to hypostatize the Word of God in our human environment. Our neighbour may become to us a means of grace if God so wills. What has just been said is not the enunciation of a vague humanitarianism. The Word of God does not come to us in the form of a general rule. It is always a concrete imperative in the strictest sense of the word 'concrete.'

With this safeguard we must now go on to examine somewhat more closely our relation to our human environment. The governing idea in Barth's mind is that society in its various manifestations, such as family and State and Church, is held together by the mutual recognition of the claims which one man can make on another; but, further, that if these societies or communities are to be means of grace to us, if they are to be the spheres within which we may work out in concrete fashion our relation to Christ, then the human claims must have divine authorization. And yet once again the divine authority must not be hypostatized in the human authority. That way lie tyranny and dogmatism. It is a way haunted by the shadow of the Grand Inquisitor. Human authority may not seat itself on the throne of God. Nevertheless it may become the medium of the divine authority, and so we should not too hastily refuse it our obedience.

To take one example of such an authority, namely, the authority of the teacher—Barth is often criticised on the ground that he completely disqualifies human morality and that therefore he has no guidance to give us in the important matter of training children. In actual fact, Barth allows a very real place to moral education. Education has its two sides, intellectual and moral, and in both alike the child is subjected to a discipline which is designed to fit him to take his place in the fellowship of humanity and play a worthy part therein. The education which Barth criticises is the education which has the effect, which is designed to have the effect, of making the subject of it assert his freedom and independence, which does nothing to remind him of his real situation as a sinner requiring correction, the education, in short, which leads to intellectual and moral pride. That we should humbly do our best to play a worthy part in those human relationships in which we find ourselves, submitting for our brethren's sakes to the authority

of those who, like ourselves, are sinners before God, placing ourselves at the disposal of those who have no moral, but, as we trust, a divine claim upon us—that is what we *may* do, not that we should thereby turn the edge of God's judgment upon us, but because to live like that is seemly for those whose only standing-ground is beneath the Cross. If we have faith, then, the obedience in which our faith becomes actual will be a life after this fashion.

Barth, however, is nothing if not realistic in the way in which he faces up to the truth about the human heart. To speak about obedience or faith in general is not enough. A man must speak about himself and his own relation to God and his neighbour. And so Barth would say that, when a man looks into his own heart, he is at once conscious of a very equivocal state of affairs. There is not only faith there, there is also its opposite. If he dares to speak of obedience at all, he must also speak of disobedience. This means that his very relation to God as one who is reconciled is jeopardized. When I come to realize that God's word of forgiveness must have its correlative in the faith which accepts it, I at once strike on the difficulty that faith as an empirical fact, as a fact of experience—is not enough. For the faith which I experience is always shadowed by unbelief. I never have the one without the other. And so, if I turn faith in God into faith in my own faith, then I am trusting in what can only prove a broken reed. I can have faith only in *God*, and it is of the very nature of such faith that it should be tested continually by the grim doubt in its own sufficiency and be compelled to cast itself on God alone. 'Lord, I believe. Help thou mine unbelief.' That is what we *actually do* say when we are not trying to bolster up a theory. There is such a thing as the assurance of faith, but it is always the assurance of *faith*. Faith is not knowledge. It is only God who knows.

The Christian life is, therefore, of the kind that the Christian has nothing in himself to point to that is not ambiguous. The temptation that besets him is to try and salve a few planks from the wreckage and lash them together to form a raft on which to find some little security on his own account. But, if we may change the figure somewhat abruptly, the Word of God confronts the Christian in Jesus and its challenge is 'Follow thou me,' and all the Christian can do is to stumble after Him, leaving even the question of whether his faith and obedience are genuine in God's hands. This is Christian *experience*. Does the Christian believe on the basis

of his experience? Would it not be truer to say that he believes in spite of his experience, that he believes God's Unbelievable Word in spite of all appearances to the contrary?

The Christian, then, has nothing in himself to which he can trust, but God sets him in an *Unio Mystica* with Christ and, as we have seen, to be in union with Christ involves union with the brethren. And so when Christ says 'Follow me,' He is summoning us to a life of service in His Church, in the fellowship of those who recognize each other as brethren for Jesus' sake. But the Church must not keep closed doors. They are to stand open to the needy world outside and, if the Church should close them, it would shut Jesus out. God can speak to us, claim us, through those who are outside and, as we respond to that claim it may be given to us to bring them within the Church. That is the Church's missionary activity.

The Church of Christ is always the Church under the Sign of the Cross. Those inside it are not separated from the world on the score that they are better than those outside. If we apply moral standards the opposite may often be true. The distinction is that those inside have faith, however broken and imperfect it may seem, in the Incarnate Word of God, the Word which humbles and forgives and summons to deeds of loving service. As such this Church is constituted in the world by God.

Within this Church witness is borne to the Word of God. There is the witness of Christian lives, but there is also the peculiar witness of the Christian preacher. It is with this phenomenon of Christian preaching that theology concerns itself. Its subject-matter is what the preacher says, not what God says. It is, therefore, the word of man and not the Word of God. The Christian preacher appeals to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments because it is in relation to the witness contained in them that God has spoken most clearly to him. These Scriptures must not be confused with the Word of God; they contain man's most authentic witness to it. The witness that they bear is that Jesus is the Christ, that Jesus is the Word of God, and what enables us to accept this witness is the mysterious corroborating witness in our hearts which the Christian can only call 'testimonium Spiritus sancti internum,' the witness which has sounded in the Christian Church down the centuries.

Jesus confronts us as the Word of God, the Word which judges and reconciles and summons to service. He is also the Word of Promise. 'Resurrection,' 'Advent,' 'Kingdom of God'—these

are words which span like a rainbow the strange, contradictory world in which we live. For the Church is not the Kingdom of God; it is the fellowship of those who are waiting and hasting towards the Kingdom, hoping and praying for its coming, toiling, not that they may bring it in—that can be accomplished by God alone—but because God can use the witness of humble, loving service to ensure that when Christ comes in glory He shall find a people waiting for Him.

Would we like to claim more for this human life

of ours? Would we like to live not just by faith, to have Christ without His incognito, to know here and now even as also we are known? That is the temptation against which Barth would warn us. Has he overstated his case? Has he mistakenly sharpened the paradox of the Christian life until we seem to be left with nothing but the bare contraries of atheism? If Barth has overstated the paradox, as many think, he has at least made us realize that there is a paradox, and that is a truth that we have sometimes been tempted to forget.

Some New Exegetical Points in the Psalms.¹

BY PROFESSOR SAMUEL DAICHES, PH.D., LONDON.

In my *Studies in the Psalms*, published last summer by the Oxford University Press (as Jews' College Publication No. 12), I ventured to offer new interpretations for several Biblical terms as אדם, חבל, אנוש, גוים, בני אדם, and, as a result, also new interpretations of several Psalms and various passages in other parts of the Bible. I am of the opinion that there is a large field of internal exegesis of the Bible waiting to be worked. By internal exegesis I mean an exegesis which tries to understand the text of the Bible from within, as distinguished from the exegesis which endeavours to explain the Bible by means from without, especially by means of the languages and literatures of Mesopotamia and Egypt. This latter exegesis I would call, for the sake of brevity, excavation-exegesis. I do not underrate the importance of excavation-exegesis. But I venture to suggest that the internal exegesis has been somewhat neglected in recent times.

In this paper I should like to offer briefly new interpretations of a few passages in the Psalms.

1. Ps 10³ is regarded as difficult. בני הלל רשע על. תאות נפשו ובצע בך נאן יהוה. [I hope to show on a future occasion that already in the time of the Psalmists יהוה was pronounced 'Adonai.'] Gunkel (*Die Psalmen*, 1926, p. 37) says: 'Aber der Text enthält auch so noch grosse Schwierigkeiten: הלל wird nicht mit על konstruiert und zu בך fehlt das Objekt.' And so alterations of the text are proposed; see Gunkel, Duhm, and other commentaries, also Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*.

¹ Paper read before the Eighteenth International Congress of Orientalists at Leiden (7-12th September 1931).

I suggest that the verse is to be explained in the following manner. In my *Studies in the Psalms*, p. 44, I endeavoured to show that אָח has sometimes the same meaning as אָה, and that the same also applies to עַל. In this verse עַל stands for אָה. V.^{3a} would therefore simply mean: 'For (or, better, surely) the wicked praises the desire of his soul.' V.^{3b} I translate: 'And the greedy blesses what the Lord contemns.' The style is short, cf. v.⁴. אָה אִשֶּׁר is to be supplemented, in one's mind. נאן with God as subject occurs in Dt 32¹⁹, Jer 14²¹, and La 2⁶. The meaning of the verse is perfectly clear, and the text remains intact. In v.¹³ נאן is applied to the רשע. There seems to be more force in the question אֵלֶּיֶם רשע אֵלֶּיֶם, 'why does the wicked contemn God?' after having said previously, 'and the greedy blesses what God contemns.' Note in v.³ the verbs הלל and בָּרַךְ, generally used for praising, or blessing, God. There is, no doubt, conscious irony in the use of these words. The 'praise' and the 'blessing' the wicked reserves for what his soul desires and for what God spurns!

2. Ps 11⁵ (יהוה צדיק יבחן ורשע וואבן חסם שנאה נפשו) is regarded as difficult; see commentaries, especially Duhm and Gunkel, also König, *Die Psalmen*, pp. 583-4. In my *Studies in the Psalms*, p. 3, I suggested that צדיק is not an object, but that it refers to God, and I translated the verse as follows: 'God the righteous tries (tests)'—the בני אדם mentioned in v.⁴, 'and the wicked and him that loveth violence His soul hateth.' I suggested that צדיק in v.³ refers to God, just as צדיק in v.⁷ refers to God. In Ps 7^{10b} and 12^a God is called צדיק. ובוהן לבות וכליות אֱלֹהִים צדיק; אֱלֹהִים שופט צדיק. I have since come to the conclusion that בָּחַן with

I may just add that God is called **צדיק** many times in the Bible: cf. Ex 9²⁷, Dt 32⁴, Jer 12¹.

3. Ps 117^ט (יִשְׂרָאֵל יִחְזוּ פָּנָיו) has been variously interpreted. Most versions translate 'the upright shall behold his face.' Gunkel says (p. 43): 'man lese mit Wellhausen und Budde יִשְׂרָאֵל und פָּנָיו, "Gerechte schauen sein Antlitz." Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, also reads יִשְׂרָאֵל. Duhm alters פָּנָיו into פָּנֵינוּ. I suggest the following explanation: יִשְׂרָאֵל means 'the upright,' 'what is upright.' Cf. Job 33²⁷, וְיִשְׂרָאֵל הָעֲדִיתִי, 'and what was right (the right, the upright) I have perverted'; cf. also 2 K 10¹⁵, הֵיטֵב אֶחָד לְכָכֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל. הֵיטֵב הָיָה (בעיני יהוה). הֵיטֵב occurs many times in the Bible. יִשְׂרָאֵל refers to God. For לוֹ as singular, see Gesenius-Kautzsch's *Hebrew Grammar*, § 103. The meaning of פָּנָיו is 'the upright, the right (what is right, upright)—in German it would be "das Gerechte"—"sees his face," that is, "his face sees (only) what is right."' יִשְׂרָאֵל יִחְזוּ פָּנָיו is a true parallel to צְדִיקוֹת אֲהָבָה. 'God is righteous, righteousness he loveth, the upright sees his face.' The words יִשְׂרָאֵל יִחְזוּ פָּנָיו express more positively the same idea that is contained in the words of Hab 1¹³, כְּחוֹד עֵינַיִם מֵרָאוֹת רַע וְהִבֵּיתִי אֶל עֹמֶל לֹא תוֹכֵל, 'Thou art pure of eyes (of purer eyes) than to behold evil and canst not look on iniquity.' God can look only on what is upright. The Septuagint have the right sense of the words: εὐθύτητα εἶδε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, 'His face beholds uprightness.' Only it is not 'uprightness,' but 'the upright.' That we have here פָּנָיו instead of עֵינָיו is not strange at all (see Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, p. 134). The face sees through the eyes, and 'the face' expresses more than 'the eyes.' Cf., especially, Ex 33^{12, 13} (בעיני), הוּא חֲכָמִים בְּעֵינֵיהֶם, Is 2², וְהִסְתֵּר פָּנָיו בְּלֹא רָאָה לָנֶפֶשׁ, and Ps 10¹¹, וְנִגַּד פָּנָיו מִנְּבוֹנִים. יִשְׂרָאֵל יִחְזוּ פָּנָיו is therefore perfectly in order. V.7 emphasizes the righteousness of God.

Incidentally we can now understand better Ps 37³⁷, שְׁמֹר פֶּתֶם וּרְאֵה יִשְׁרָאֵל כִּי אַחֲרִית לְאִישׁ שָׁלוֹם. Most versions translate: 'Mark the perfect man and behold the upright.' Gunkel and others read (with the old versions) רָאָה, וְיִשְׁרָאֵל, and emend רָאָה, 'see,' into רָעָה, 'feed.' All this is quite unnecessary. פֶּתֶם means 'what is perfect,' 'das Vollkommene,' and יִשְׁרָאֵל, 'what is upright,' 'das Gerechte.' 'What is perfect' and 'what is upright' expresses more than 'perfection' and 'uprightness.' And רָאָה, 'see,' is very good. Just as God sees only what is upright (Ps 11⁷), so man should see only what is

upright. *שכן ארץ ורעה אמונה* (Ps 37³) portrays a different picture altogether. There is no misunderstanding on the part of the Massorites (see Gunkel). But the words *וְהָם* and *יָשָׁר* are to be understood in the neuter, and they give excellent sense. 'Guard what is perfect and see what is upright, for there is a future for the man of peace.' He who guards what is perfect and sees (only) what is upright is a man of peace. The sense of the words *כִּי אַחֲרֵי* is so simple and so satisfactory that one is amazed at the emendations and alterations proposed by commentators like Kittel and Gunkel.

4. Let us now look at Ps 35¹⁵, *וּבְצִלֵּי שִׁמְחוּ וְנִאֲסָפוּ*. This verse has been a *crux interpretum* from earliest times; cf. versions and commentaries. The English version translates: 'But when I halted they rejoiced and gathered themselves together; the abjects gathered themselves together against me, and I knew it not; they did tear me and ceased not.' Olshausen and Graetz read *נִכְרְמוּ* instead of *נִכְרְמוּ*, Kittel and Gunkel read *בְּנִכְרְמוּ*, Duhm reads *נִכְרְמוּ*. Instead of *קָרְעוּ* Gunkel and others read *קָרְאוּ*. Gunkel translates: 'Doch, da ich nun wanke, triumphieren sie und rotten sich, rotten sich wider mich. "Wie Fremde," und die ich nicht kenne, "schreien sie" ohn Unterlass.' Almost every commentator gives a different translation. In Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* and *קָרְאוּ* are incorporated in the notes. In a word, the verse seems hopeless.

I suggest the following translation of this verse: 'And in my stumbling (misfortune) they rejoiced and gathered themselves together, they gathered themselves together (came) to me (as) depressed, and I did not know: (that) they tore (their garments) and did not mean it.' I have given the translation first, as it projects the explanation, which shall now follow. The Psalmist wants to say that, while he honestly shared the grief of those who were supposed to be his friends, they only simulated friendship. When they were in trouble he truly mourned. But when misfortune befell him they rejoiced inwardly, and still they came to him feigning sympathy. They came to him as if they were depressed. And he did not know that it was all pose. He did not know that, while they tore their garments as an outward sign of their grief, they did not mean it. It was simulation and falsehood from beginning to end. The real feeling of his alleged friends is expressed by *שִׁמְחוּ*, 'they rejoiced.' They rejoiced over his misfortune.

Still they came (*וְנִאֲסָפוּ*). They came ostensibly to console him, to show him their sympathy. They came and looked depressed: *נִאֲסָפוּ עָלַי נִכְרְמוּ*. *נִאֲסָפוּ עָלַי* does not mean 'against me,' but 'to me.' *עָלַי* has the same meaning as *אֵלַי*, with the additional flavour of 'round me'; cf. *נִצַּב עָלַי*, 'stood against me'; *נִכַּח עָלַי*, 'smitten,' 'stricken,' and has the same meaning as *נִכְרְמוּ*. Cf. Is 66², *נִכְרְמוּ*, 'contrite of spirit.' Ibn-Ezra already mentions this interpretation; see also *Rashi*. *נִכְרְמוּ* does not mean 'heruntergekommene Menschen' (see Delitzsch), but it means what it says: 'contrite' (of spirit), 'depressed.' They simulated depression. They even tore their garments. And he did not know that it was all hypocrisy. *קָרְעוּ* no doubt refers to their garments. They tore their garments as a sign of grief. But they did not mean it. *קָרְעוּ* comes from *רָמָה* and has the same meaning as *רָמָה* (*Piel*): 'they thought.' Why should not the *Kal* have the same meaning as the *Piel*? The *dagesh* in the *Mem* may be due to outward assimilation to *רָמָה*. Thus explained the verse is completely satisfactory.

These are a few illustrations of what I call internal interpretation. I hope to give more in a future publication.

I should like just to mention that I have come to the conclusion that alliteration plays an important part in the poetry of the Psalms. Professor Ley has to some extent dealt with alliteration in Hebrew poetry (see Delitzsch, *Die Psalmen*, p. 19). But he does not deal with its exegetical consequences. The same applies to others who have treated the subject; see *Revue des Études Juives*, April-June 1931, p. 204. I have observed that the exegetical consequences are many and considerable. I am afraid that alliteration plays havoc with emendations. Allow me to give you one example. In Ps 31²¹ occurs the word *רִבְכִּי* (*מִרְבְּכִי* *אִישׁ*) *רִבְכִּי* is quite a legitimate word: 'bindings,' 'plottings.' But Olshausen, Bickell, Duhm, and Gunkel read *רִכְלִי* instead of *רִבְכִּי*; see also *Biblia Hebraica*. But what becomes of this emendation if we look at the verse in the light of alliteration? *רִכְלִי* and *רִבְכִּי* are essential. *רִבְכִּי* must therefore stand. I hope to deal extensively with alliteration and its exegetical consequences in the near future.

I shall be happy if the suggestions I have had the honour of placing before you in this paper will receive your favourable consideration.

Literature.

A GREAT ENTERPRISE.

THE Student Christian Movement Press has laid the religious world under a real debt by its production of *The Teachers' Commentary*. It has been edited by the Rev. Hugh Martin in association with Dr. T. H. Robinson (for the Old Testament) and Dr. L. W. Grensted (for the New Testament). It is a marvel of cheapness at 8s. 6d. net. As a matter of fact there is nothing quite like it on the market. Superficially it resembles Peake's Commentary, particularly in the number of general articles. But even in these there is a difference, since some of them are of special value to teachers. The difference from all other commentaries, however, lies in the fact that this book has been 'planned in every detail to meet the practical demands of Bible teaching in day school and Sunday school.' And this is apparent in the mode of treatment applied to the text, as well as in the names of those who have done the work. Among the writers of general introduction articles are Professor J. E. McFadyen, Miss Entwistle, Dr. Raven, Professor J. A. Findlay, Mr. H. G. Wood, Professor Grensted, and Professor Robinson. The writers of the actual commentary are all specialists in religious education, and include many women teachers of experience. There are, of course, some excellent maps and a few illustrative drawings. The bibliographies are full and supply adequate guidance for further study, though, as a fact, all a teacher needs he will find in this book.

It is strange that a commentary for teachers has not been produced before this. Now that one has appeared, so admirably edited, so competently written, and so cheap, teachers of the Bible will have little difficulty in finding the help they need or their important work.

THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF PALESTINE.

In *The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible* (Revell; £2.00), by Professor William Foxwell Albright, the well-known Professor of Semitic Languages at Johns Hopkins University, and the Director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem from 1920 to 1929, we have a thoroughly informed book, giving a survey of the recent evolution of Palestinian archæology, and the effect of the latest discoveries on the Bible as a source of history. The book consists of an expansion of the Richards

Lectures delivered last year at the University of Virginia. In the first chapter, Professor Albright details the progress in Palestinian archæology from the time of Edward Robinson (in 1838) onward, reviewing the American, British, German, and Danish excavations within recent times. The second chapter contains an historical sketch of the excavations at *Tell Beit Mirsim*, with which Albright has been specially associated. The third and last chapter is perhaps the most interesting of all, for here he describes the bearing of archæology on certain Biblical problems affected, such as the Age of the Patriarchs, the Law of Moses, and the Period of the Exile and Restoration. The author's point of view is an independent one. It does not reflect the attitude of any special school of thought, and is neither strictly conservative nor liberal. His conclusions in general are based mainly on his own researches. Many scholars will no doubt differ from him on several points, such as the nature and date of the Exodus, the doubtfulness of the tradition deriving Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees, the question of the identity of Amraphel with Hammurabi, the date of Chedorlaomer's attack, the meaning of 'Yahweh,' and other matters. But altogether the book is most interesting and fascinating (there is not a dull page anywhere). The author shows how recent discoveries have established the accuracy of innumerable Biblical details and brought increased recognition of the Bible as an historical source. Coming as the book does from such a competent archæologist and Semitic scholar, it deserves, and will no doubt have, a wide circulation among both Biblical students and laymen.

LEONARD BACON.

It is a daring thing to publish a biography of a minister fifty years after he has been in his grave, and only a life of exceptional interest and importance could justify it. But this biography of *Leonard Bacon* is fully justified (Milford; 30s. net), for he powerfully influenced American life last century at many points, some of supreme interest. He was a resolute opponent of intemperance at a time when hard drinking was almost as much the fashion as hard thinking; he was one of the chief protagonists in the conflict for the abolition of slavery, and he was the champion of freedom of religious thought. During his long life—he was

born in 1802 and died in 1881—he filled many rôles as editor, historian, teacher, controversialist on governmental, moral, and religious questions; after fourteen years of ministerial service he was offered the Chair of Rhetoric in Yale, and at the close of his pastorate in 1866, after forty-one years of service, he was made ‘acting professor’; but ‘it was always as a minister that he spoke and wrote.’

He was a man of overwhelming energy, who cared infinitely more for truth than for party, and who consequently often surprised his friends. On the temperance question, for example, while a teetotaler himself, he was an opponent of prohibition, ‘the relentless foe of the liquor traffic, and equally of the false philosophy that hopes to eradicate it by statute.’ On the slavery question, while cordially agreeing with William Lloyd Garrison that slavery was wrong, he differed from him, to the point of conflict, as to the method of curing the evil; and it was a book of his that had much to do with the shaping of Abraham Lincoln’s own thinking on the subject of slavery. These facts explain the sub-title of the book, ‘A Statesman in the Church.’ For the historian of religious thought, not the least interesting feature of the book is the story of the passage of the New England Churches from a rigid Calvinism to a large freedom in doctrine and polity. The story is very fully and vividly told; and the book, which runs to five hundred and sixty-three pages, furnishes valuable insight not only into religious life one hundred years ago in New England, but into the life of Yale, when academic expenses were vastly less than they are to-day, and into the primitive conditions which prevailed still earlier in the century over wide areas which now hum with life, but were then sparsely populated and dotted with Indian villages.

It is quite impossible in a brief notice to give any idea of the fulness of the human as well as of the religious, theological, and political interest of this important book. We are here told, for example, of the attempt to bring Horace Bushnell to trial for heresy, of the cloud that hung for a time over Henry Ward Beecher, of ‘Uncle Tom’s Cabin,’ and of a visit, full of thrills, to Kurdistan, in which Bacon nearly lost his life at the hand of bandits. The bulk of the volume was written by Bacon’s grandson, Theodore Davenport Bacon, who died eighteen months ago; it was completed and edited by his brother, Benjamin W. Bacon, whose death this year on February 1st is a grave loss to New Testament scholarship.

MIND AND BODY.

Mr. Charles Fox, who made his mark with an important book on ‘Educational Psychology,’ has, we think, done even better in *The Mind and its Body, the Foundations of Psychology* (Kegan Paul, 10s. 6d. net). The main topics handled are Psychological Physiology, Physiological Psychology, Psychology of Language, Psychology of Temperament, Mental Energy, Instinct and Custom, Mental Imagery, Educational Psychology, Mind and Body. Mr. Fox is fully abreast of the latest investigations, and every chapter is worth careful attention. His most interesting conclusions are contained in the last sections and include such as these—the problem of matter and mind is not the same as that of body and mind; it is preposterous to hold with the ‘new’ psychology that inhibition and suppression are invariably bad for the organism; we must distinguish the Ego from the psychoplasm if we are ever to understand how mind is related to body; we must consider the mind-body problem not as spectators outside, but as experiencers from the inside; the questions of Freedom and Immortality are clarified by the distinction of Mind in the sense of the Ego from Mind in the sense of psychoplasm; there is no one-by-one relationship between mind and brain. We cordially recommend this very readable and suggestive treatise.

SCIENCE AND THEISM.

In his recent work, *Philosophy of the Sciences* (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), Dr. F. R. Tennant, B.Sc., publishes six lectures delivered under the Tarner Foundation at Trinity College, Cambridge, during the academic year 1931–32. His hope was to be of service to students devoting themselves more or less exclusively to some one of the many departments of knowledge by inviting their attention to certain relations in which typical sciences stand to one another and to knowledge as a co-ordinated whole. In particular, he was anxious that they should be warned against what he calls the specialist’s fallacy of departmentality.

He maintains that the psychology of knowledge and history are both of them fundamental studies from the point of view, not of science, but of a philosophy of the sciences. Distinguishing historiography from history and describing it as history passing into philosophy, he maintains that dogmatic theology, or the field of revealed truth, is dependent on historiography and its truth accordingly bound

p with the adequacy of the historian's interpretation of the primitive data. As for theology in general, it is not an independent and isolated science, derivable from judgments of value, as the Ritschlians would maintain, but an outgrowth from ordinary knowledge as to the world and man, revealed theology presupposing natural theology.

These and other positions Dr. Tennant elaborates with the learning and critical ability which we have learned to expect of the author of 'Philosophical Theology'; and theologians will be specially interested in his reaffirmation in this work of theistic teleology. 'The faith involved in theism such as is based on cumulative teleological considerations is essentially the same as that belief in the world's rationality which is presupposed by the logic and method of science, and theistic beliefs but a continuation, by extrapolation, or through points representing further observations, of the curve of "knowledge" which natural science has constructed. In short, science and theism spring from a common root.'

DR. ADLER ON HUMAN PROBLEMS.

Dr. Adler is the protagonist of Individual Psychology, and if you read his latest book, in which, as it were, comes down into the market place, and mixes with us common folk, *What Life Should Mean to You*, edited by Alan Porter (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), you will very likely come to the conclusion that Individual Psychology is not a bad name for common sense. Not that we agree with all he says. For example, he seems to think that our very earliest memory is always significant of what is fundamental in our purposes. But if your earliest memory is of getting your nose bled, or getting your finger pinched in a door, how about that? Again he says, 'I have found a surprising number of neurotic children among the children of doctors and of delinquent children among the children of ministers of religion.' This amazing statement would probably be negated by any one who had a really extensive acquaintance with either of these professions.

But these are the errata of a wise and shrewd observer. His common sense is shown in his attitude to the notorious 'inferiority complex,' about which he goes so far as to say that it is the cause of all improvements in the condition of mankind. The same sensible attitude is found in his remarks on crime and criminals which are free of all sentimentalism, and in what he says about imparting sex information to children. Dr. Adler

brings the same healthy mind to bear on all that he discusses—dreams, occupation, love and marriage, mind and body, family influence, adolescence, and other topics. One of his leading ideas is that all human failure is a failure in social interest, and that many of the evils that we discover in men and women could be prevented by the training of children in a habit of regard for others. This is a sound book.

In *Through Experience to Faith* (Abingdon Press; \$1.50) the Rev. F. K. Stamm begins with an account of an experience in which God became real to him, and proceeds in this book to talk, in a series of essays, of various aspects of religious life. It is good talk, and says many interesting and suggestive things about 'A Child's Religion,' 'The Religion of a College Student,' 'Can we trust God to do the Right?' 'The Authority of Jesus in a World like This,' and other matters.

Mr. V. D. Davis, B.A., has written a most interesting and valuable *History of Manchester College* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. net), from its foundation in 1786 to its establishment in Oxford in 1889. The story will naturally have its chief interest for Unitarians, but Manchester College has never been a denominational foundation; among its teachers there have been Trinitarians; some of its students have passed into various Nonconformist ministries, some into the Church of England, while others again have been laymen who have in many cases attained honoured positions in law, commerce, science, and medicine. Mr. Davis greatly adds to the value of his book by tracing earlier stages which led to the opening of the College, and which sprang from the determination of Nonconformists from 1670 onwards to make provision for the education of their children, and for the training of an adequate succession in the ministry. The successive migrations of the College from Manchester (1786-1803), to York (1803-40), back again to Manchester (1840-53), thence to London (1853-89), and finally to Oxford in 1889, are well described, as well as the outstanding personalities associated with its history, including Charles Wellbeloved, John James Tayler, James Martineau, James Drummond, J. Estlin Carpenter, and L. P. Jacks. All the way through its history, the original principle of freedom from dogmatic constraint has been observed, so that the inscription: 'To Truth, to Liberty, to Religion,' has its fitting place over the entrance to the College at Oxford. The reason given for the choice of

Oxford is interesting. 'Oxford was preferred to Cambridge, because of its great historical significance and its stronger appeal to religious interests. "From the days of Wiclif to those of Wesley and of Newman," it was pleaded, "Oxford has been the cradle of those movements of thought which have most stimulated and refreshed the religious life of England," and contact with the atmosphere of the University could not fail both to widen and invigorate the mental outlook of the students' (p. 170 f.). Mr. Davis has done more than tell the story of a College; he has afforded us glimpses into the lives of teachers of theology and philosophy, many of whom on small incomes of about £100 a year were content to spend their days in seclusion for the sake of the students who passed through their hands. The story is inspiring as well as informative, and is unfolded by an author who combines gifts of style and historical insight with the patience and skill of a chronicler.

Krishnamurti, by Lilly Heber, Ph.D. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), gives an interesting and wholly uncritical account of one whose name has been before the world since his childhood. Krishnamurti, as many will remember, was selected by Mrs. Annie Besant to be trained as the coming Messiah of the Theosophists. At the age of thirty, after years of study in Europe and America, he renounced his Messiahship, dissolved the Order of the Star in the East, and declared himself against all creeds and forms. While he appears to be a man of great honesty and courage and of a most lovable disposition, there is nothing new in his message. He preaches a form of pantheism dear to the Eastern mind, wherein peace is attained through identity with the All. Somewhat illogically, however, Krishnamurti is keenly interested in social evolution through the regeneration of the individual. God is to be found only within the soul, and man is his own saviour. A profoundly dreary creed.

To any one who wants a simple introduction to the comparative study of religion we can commend *Religion: Its Basis and Development*, by the Rev. H. Montague Dale, B.D. (Allenson; 5s. net). After discussing the definition of religion and its universal prevalence the writer goes on to trace its origin and evolution. Thereafter he treats of such topics as Religion and Social Evolution, the influence of Religion on Art and Law, Conduct and Character, concluding with a chapter on the Future of Religion. The work is intended for the

general reader rather than the expert, but it is carefully done, and Mr. Dale shows himself throughout a safe and interesting guide.

A series of conversations between a motion-picture actor and a dean of a school of religious science ought to be interesting. We are informed that the conversations included in the book, *Values, a Philosophy of Human Needs* (Cambridge University Press; 5s. 6d. net), actually occurred and are recorded exactly as they took place. They may have been meant for publication, and this would explain the somewhat stilted note in them. There is, as a matter of fact, nothing very profound or original or brilliant in the words of either Mr. Milton Sills or Mr. Ernest S. Holmes. They talk in a high-brow fashion of the main problems of existence, but do not seem to get anywhere very definite. The talk never ceases, however, to be goodish talk, and it was perhaps worth recording.

The Indispensable Soul, by Mr. William H. Crawshaw (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net), is an interesting and pleasantly written argument against materialism. In a series of a dozen chapters, whose titles are singularly felicitous, the writer treats of the soul in its various contacts with the outer world and other souls, its intuitions and limitations. The treatment is not by any means technical or profound, but it is rich in good sense and shows evidence of wide reading and competent knowledge of the subject.

We are specially interested in *The Idealistic Conception of Religion*, by Miss Aline Lion, D.Phil. (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). For one thing the authoress writes a very creditable English, to her an acquired language. More than that, as a personal disciple of Gentile, her essay is largely an account of that thinker's views on religion. The views of Vico and of Hegel are also constantly before her. While Gentile's views are in the main followed, and especially so in the writer's claim for religion that it is autonomous and permanent so that neither science nor philosophy can take its place, her independence of thought is frequently shown in shrewd criticism of some of the modes of expression of her master.

Reunion and Nonconformity, by the Rev. W. G. Peck (Mowbray & Co.; 2s. 6d. net), is written with the utmost clarity. No one can be for a moment in doubt as to the writer's position. The book consists of four lectures delivered at a clergy

school on the invitation of the Archbishop of York. Why they should have been entitled 'Reunion' it is hard to say, except that they go to show its hopelessness. Speaking as an unbending High Churchman, Mr. Peck, an ex-Methodist, points out the shortcomings of Nonconformists in a spirit of great complacency, and makes it plain that for those who think like him, Reunion means submission. This is emphatically not the way to sweeten the bitter waters.

Dr. Campbell Morgan's method of exposition is too well known to need detailed description. In *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (Oliphants; 8s. 6d. net) he gives us what is really a series of expository lectures, scriptural, earnest, and warmly evangelical. He does not fill his pages with critical questions, but strikes straight for the living heart of the gospel. His exposition is extremely readable, and preachers especially will find it most suggestive and rich in sermon matter.

It is an evidence of the still widening influence of Karl Barth that so many have taken in hand to summarize and elucidate his teaching. For a brief, straightforward, and simple exposition of it nothing could be better than *The Message of Karl Barth*, by the Rev. W. G. Hanson (R.T.S.; 1s. net). The writer quotes freely from the standard books, but he has passed the subject sympathetically through his own mind, and he writes with great clearness. He adds a questionnaire in which many suggestive points are raised.

A History of Fire and Flame, by Mr. Oliver de C. Ellis (Simpkin, Marshall; 15s. net), is an extraordinary compilation. One can only look with amazement upon the accumulation of material here offered to the patient reader. Everything connected with fire, whether near or remote, is gathered from primitive superstitions, from the Greek physicists and philosophers, the mediæval alchemists, down to the latest experiments with unsun burners and electric currents. The writing is highly imaginative, but can hardly be called lucid. The writer speaks of his task as possessing the fascinating irksomeness of a schoolboy's problem or of a jig-saw.' The impression left on the reader's mind is that the pieces of the puzzle are still in some confusion, and probably few will think it worth while to travel through the maze. At the same time the work abounds in many curious facts and suggestive ideas.

Sex again! So many books are written about

sex problems that one begins to wonder whether Freud's exaggerations do not cover much truth. *Sex, Marriage, and Religion*, however, is a good book. Its author is Mr. Alec R. Vidler, M.A., 'Of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, Cambridge,' and therefore probably a parson, certainly a bachelor, and in any case a man of shrewd insight and a good deal of common sense (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d.). The book discusses the four moral problems associated with sex: (1) divorce, (2) the respective status of men and women in marriage, (3) extra-marital relations, and (4) the use of contraceptives in marriage. That is a pretty hefty programme for a small book. But the thing is well done, from the 'catholic' standpoint. Divorce in any circumstances is rejected, but on other points there is greater tolerance. This is a book to be commended.

The late Dr. Arthur W. Robinson left behind him a collection of prayers, partly his own composition, partly his choice and use from other sources. These have now been published under the title *Prayers New and Old* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). As may be imagined, they show the obvious signs of a fine spiritual 'taste.' The appendix of sources shows how catholic his outlook was. Aquinas and Brahma Bandao Upadhyaya, Erasmus and Dr. Johnson, Laud and James Martineau, Muhammad and Dr. Pusey are represented here. This is not a book to discuss. It will be sufficient to mention its appearance. For those who knew what Dr. Robinson was will know what his prayers (made or selected) are certain to be.

Life in the Chinese Church, by the Rev. T. Ralph Morton (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is a little book written with great insight and sympathy. The writer confines himself strictly to his subject and succeeds in giving an unusually vivid picture of the average Chinese Christian and the average Chinese Church. It should help many in the West to a fuller comprehension of the problems and perplexities of a Church struggling to get an intellectual and moral foothold for its faith. It is a book that should be widely read and pondered.

Dr. John R. Mott holds a unique position in the Christian world as a missionary statesman. He was chairman of the two World Missionary Conferences of Edinburgh 1910 and Jerusalem 1928. After the 1910 Conference he wrote 'The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions,' and now, following upon the 1928 Conference he has given us an up-

to-date review of the missionary situation under the title of *The Present-Day Summons to the World Mission of Christianity* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). Surveying so vast a field, Dr. Mott is compelled to condense to an extreme degree. One need not look here for wealth of detail and pictorial illustration. The appeal is rather to reason, statesmanship, and Christian loyalty. The book is a rousing trumpet call to the Church of the West to marshal her forces for the great religious Armageddon which is so manifestly impending.

Martyrdom in our Times, by Mr. A. Mitchell Innes (Williams & Norgate; 3s. 6d. net), is written

with great warmth of feeling and intensity of conviction. It is a powerful indictment of our system of prisons and punishments. The writer, who has had varied experience in government work abroad, especially in the East, has nothing good to say of our penal system, and contrasts it unfavourably with the patriarchal and, as he believes, more humane and religious systems of the East. His account of the origin of our penal system could not possibly be accepted as historically accurate, and one cannot but feel that his statement is one-sided throughout. Still, the side he presents has perhaps been too long neglected, and it is one which Christian people at least dare not lightly disregard.

The Life and Work of Dr. Albert Schweitzer.¹

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM FULTON, D.D., B.Sc., GLASGOW.

WHEN I was honoured with the invitation to give the Opening Address, my first idea was to offer an account and estimate of Dr. Albert Schweitzer's book on the *Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. It was published in Germany in 1930, and has recently appeared in an English translation. But I decided, on second thoughts, not to venture upon so vexed a problem as the sources of St. Paul's religious creed. There was the danger of finding myself vainly struggling in the pitfalls of the Jewish Eschatology or blindly wrestling with the obscurities of the Greek Mystery Religions. So I said, Why not speak on Schweitzer's life and work as a whole, appending an account of his book on the Pauline mysticism? For has he not captured the imagination of Christendom as no other New Testament scholar has done?

Dr. Albert Schweitzer became famous soon after the appearance of his critical discussion of the Lives of Jesus in the book first entitled in the German original, *From Reimarus to Wrede*. It was published in 1906, and the excellent English translation by William Montgomery appeared in 1910 under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Many must recall the interest which the work excited in our theological world. Part of the interest of it

was its unteutonic vividness and even eloquence of style. But this was so far explained when we learned that this Lecturer in Theology at Strassburg was an Alsatian, and, like other men of culture in Alsace, equally versed in French and German.

He was born on 14th January 1875, in the little town of Kayserberg, in Upper Alsace, where his father was pastor of the Evangelical congregation. When Albert was six months old, Pastor Schweitzer left Kayserberg and settled at Günsbach, in the Münstertal, and there he laboured till his death in 1925. Albert was sent to school at Münster for a year, and then to the High School at Mülhausen where he qualified in 1893 for entrance to the University. At Strassburg he studied both philosophy and theology, gaining a scholarship in 1898, which took him to Paris for a winter, and to Berlin for the following summer. In the autumn of 1899 he returned to Strassburg, and became an assistant minister there, serving in that capacity for twelve years.

At the same time he was able to pursue at the University his scholarly bent. His dissertation on *Kant's Philosophy of Religion*, on which he was engaged at Paris, and which was published in 1899, had already gained for him the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. In 1900 he was made a Licentiate in Theology for a thesis on the *Problem of the Lord's Supper*. From that thesis, published in 1901

¹ From an Address given in the Chapel of the University of Glasgow on 24th November 1931, to the Society for New Testament Study.

sprang all Schweitzer's subsequent work in the field of New Testament criticism.

How was it, he asked, that a rite so essentially incapable of being repeated, inasmuch as in it Jesus Himself spoke and acted, came to be regularly celebrated after Jesus' death? From the answer we may already discern the eschatological emphasis in Schweitzer's thought: it was in preparation for the coming Messianic feast of which Jesus had spoken; the disciples were soon to drink of the fruit of the vine with Him in the Kingdom of His Father.

Schweitzer followed up his work on the Lord's Supper with another, also published in 1901, on the *Secret of Jesus' Messiahship and Passion*, in which he affirmed that Jesus' words and actions were determined, in a measure till then imperfectly appreciated, by the expectation of the near advent of the Messianic Kingdom. It was really the second part of his work on the Lord's Supper, and it gave a short sketch of the Life of Jesus from the standpoint of the 'thoroughgoing eschatology.'

The novel views of the young Strassburg theologian were received in stony silence by the liberal theologians against whom they were directed, and his work (only years afterwards translated into English, under the title of *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*) lay forgotten. But Schweitzer was nothing daunted. Persuaded that he had found the clue not only to the life of Jesus but to the story of the early Church, he resolved to write a history of all the Lives which had been published since the dawn of modern Biblical Science. In that history he would show the utter bankruptcy of liberalism, with its modernist reductions of Jesus, and the necessity of returning to the point where, even through the apocalyptic thought-forms of His age, we can recognize and experience the heroic, the authoritative, and the mysterious in Jesus. The book was issued in 1906, as already noted, and it could not be ignored. It was not received very cordially by the German critics; but, sponsored by Canon Sanday (somewhat rashly, he afterwards confessed) and Professor Burkitt, it made a deep impression at Oxford and Cambridge, and the reverberations of the furore it caused among us are hardly yet died away. I suppose no student passes through any of our Theological Colleges at the present time without hearing of the *Quest of the Historical Jesus*.

Philosophy and theology were not Schweitzer's only preoccupations in his Strassburg days. In the frank and engaging *Memoirs* of his childhood

and youth he reveals himself as a dreamy schoolboy whose backwardness and lack of application were a source of anxiety to his parents; and it may well be that his dreaminess was largely that of the artist. He had a passion for music, and in particular for the organ. Once at the age of sixteen or seventeen he was allowed to sit at the organ at an orchestral concert in Mülhausen and play the accompaniment of Brahms's *Requiem*; and then, as he tells us, he knew the joy for the first time—a joy he has often tasted since—of letting the organ send the flood of its own special tones to mingle with the music of choir and orchestra. Some two years later he presented himself to Charles Marie Widor in Paris and asked if he might be allowed to play Bach to him on the organ. It was the beginning of a long association and friendship, during which master and pupil were to learn much from each other. At Widor's instance, Schweitzer engaged upon a task which resulted in the publication of his elaborate work on *J. S. Bach*, which, originally issued in French (1905), greatly expanded in the German edition (1908), and still further expanded in the English edition (1911), is said to have contributed largely to the recent notable advance in Bach research, and to be equally valuable on the æsthetic and the practical sides.

In 1906 he wrote on *German and French Organ Construction*; and it would appear that owing in great part to his interest in and knowledge of organ-building many of the fine old organs of Europe, superior in tone and quality to the constructions of the last generations, instead of being abandoned as scrap-metal, have been restored to use, with their mechanism brought up to date.

I well remember the sensation it caused among us when the news came that Albert Schweitzer had given up his lecturing, his literary work, and his organ-playing, and had sailed as a medical missionary for French Equatorial Africa. He started on Good Friday, 1913; his wife, who is a trained nurse, accompanying him. Many thought that a Christ of merely human dimensions, albeit great and vastly impressive, could hardly have inspired such loyalty. But the 'enthusiasm of humanity' had always been strong in Schweitzer. At the age of twenty-one he had resolved that after he was thirty, should he have done what he hoped to do in philosophy, theology, and music, he would take a path of immediate service as man to his fellow-men. Moreover, he shows an attitude towards Jesus which may be described as Christological. He says that the significance of Jesus for

our time is not that He is historically known, but that He is spiritually arisen within men. He comes to us, indeed, as One unknown, as of old, by the lake-side, He came to those who knew Him not. But He speaks to us the same word, 'Follow thou me!'; and to those who obey Him, be they wise or simple, He reveals Himself, and they know who He is, through the toils and sufferings which they pass through in His fellowship. This is not traditional Christology, but it is Christology at once mystical and practical; and we can readily understand that it furnished for Schweitzer a determining motive to humanitarian enterprise.

It should be noticed in this connexion that when Schweitzer graduated Doctor of Medicine in 1913—at the age of thirty-eight—his thesis, entitled *The Psychiatric Estimate of Jesus*, was an attack upon certain writers—left-wing eschatologists, as they might be named—who looked upon Jesus as a religious psychopath, as no more than a self-deluded enthusiast. It is Schweitzer's conviction that part of the essential greatness of Jesus lies in His creation, in and through the thought-forms of His time, of a moral world which still bears His name.

Perhaps most people thought in 1913 that his missionary adventure was the last of Schweitzer, and that he would be heard of no more. But some ten years ago, with the publication of his records and impressions of work in Equatorial Africa, the famous theologian actually became a romantic figure in the story of philanthropic effort, not incomparable with that of David Livingstone himself. From the graphic pages of *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest* we learn how at the station of the Paris Evangelical Mission at Lambaréné, and in 'symbiosis' with the directors of the Mission, he erected a forest-hospital at his own expense, having raised the necessary money by giving organ concerts in Europe and by setting aside the profits from his book on J. S. Bach; and how for four years (till with his wife he was interned in France) he waged a humanitarian war against the physical miseries that afflict the negroes of the virgin forest—sleeping-sickness and dysentery and leprosy, not to speak of those dread hernias and monstrous elephantiasises that for untold generations had been awaiting the surgeon's knife.

It is the story of a later time, but it illustrates the difficulties against which 'Oganga' (fetish-man) had to contend, and the spirit in which he met them: 'One day, in my despair of some of the natives who had once more been drawing

polluted water, I threw myself into a chair in the consulting-room and groaned out: "What a blockhead I was to come out here to doctor savages like these!" Whereupon Joseph [a native helper] quietly remarked: "Yes, doctor, here on earth you are a great blockhead, but not in heaven." He likes giving utterance to sententious remarks like that. I wish he would support us better in our efforts to hinder the spread of dysentery.'

In spite of anæmia and fatigue, Schweitzer preserved his mental freshness during his sojourn at Lambaréné. If the day had not been too exhausting, he gave a couple of hours after supper to studies in ethics and civilization. 'Strange, indeed,' he records, 'are the surroundings amid which I study; my table stands inside the lattice-door which leads on to the verandah, so that I may snatch as much as possible of the light evening breeze. The palms rustle an *obligato* to the loud music of the crickets and the toads, and from the forest come harsh and terrifying cries of all sorts.' He adds, 'In this solitude I try to set in order thoughts which have been stirring in me since 1900, in the hope of giving some little help to the restoration of civilisation.'

Nearly all that Schweitzer has written appears to have been projected since about 1900. It argues a mind at once ambitious and conscious of power; it argues also a remarkable tenacity of purpose. The aforesaid studies in ethics and civilization were brought to maturity about ten years ago, when on his recovery from ill-health, and the effects of two operations, he ventured to lecture at the University of Upsala and at Mansfield College, Oxford. The lectures were published in 1923 as the Dale Memorial Lectures for 1922. During his visit to England he also delivered a course of lectures under Quaker auspices, since published, and entitled *Christianity and Other Religions*.

The work on the *Philosophy of Civilization* is in two volumes, and requires two more for its completion. In Schweitzer's view the philosophy of civilization should be founded upon a theory of the universe. And the theory of the universe which he would advocate as the only possible foundation for a broad and stable civilization is one in which the basic principle is 'reverence for life,' which is also the basic principle of all true morality. Only in the mysticism of reverence for life may the shattered sword of our Western idealism be rewelded.

To this mystical principle of reverence for life, Schweitzer seeks to be true in practice. He would

apply it not only to his relations with other men and other peoples, but also to his relations with the subhuman world,—the beast of burden under the yoke, the insect in the pool, and even the tree in the grove. His natives in Lambaréné understand his compassion for animals, but not his solicitude for palm trees. Rather than cut them down to make a clearing, he transplants those which are transplantable. It seems to the natives a perverted philosophy, especially as they have to do the uprooting and the transplanting! The self-same philosophy determines the dictum: 'The husbandman who has rightly mowed down a thousand blossoms in his meadow in providing fodder for his cattle must not on his homeward way wantonly switch off the head of a single flower.'

As a result of the War, Schweitzer lost his personal possessions and the monies belonging to his hospital, but by organ recitals and otherwise, he paid off his debts, and set out once more for Lambaréné. That was in 1924. Do not conclude too hastily that the spirit of adventure overmasters him. A German writer, who apparently speaks from knowledge, assures us that Schweitzer's own wish would have been to labour, like so many of his forebears, as a country pastor or schoolmaster, if only he might have leisure hours to spend at the organ. When he reached Lambaréné for the second time, he found grass and brushwood growing where once stood the wards he had built with so much trouble. In his recent book, *More from the Primeval Forest* (even more interesting than its predecessor), he tells the story of the rebuilding of the hospital, of the resumption of the long fight against disease and death, of fatigue and depression and frayed nerves, yet with abatement neither of sympathy and patience, nor of scientific zeal. The final effort of this second spell of work in Africa was the transference of the hospital to a larger site, running parallel to the banks of the Ogowé river, and the replacement of the bamboo huts with corrugated iron wards. For the first time since he had come to Africa, his patients were housed as human beings should be, and his heart rose in gratitude to Almighty God.

In following the routine of a doctor's life, Schweitzer is sometimes inclined to chafe against hours lost to study and reflection. But it comforts him to remember that in the life of Goethe, his greatest hero, intellectual activity and practical effort were combined. That reconciled him even to the task of planning the new hospital and acting as architect, clerk of works, foreman, and transport

agent; and even to spending weeks and months in the forest, worrying over refractory labourers, in order to wrest from it land for a plantation. Had not Goethe devised for the final activities of his *Faust* the practical task of winning land from the sea on which men could subsist? Thus Goethe was by his side in the swampy forest as one who understood.

It is another revelation of the mysticism that characterizes Schweitzer—a mystical experience of Christ, a mystical ethic and philosophy, and, shall we say, a mystical habit and sentiment.

For his health's sake Schweitzer had to return to Europe in 1927, and it was then he set about the composition of his latest theological work, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. He had corrected it for the press before leaving Europe for the third time in 1929, but the Preface was written while he was on the Ogowé steamer on the way to Lambaréné. For aught I know he is still at Lambaréné. But we never know when he may be back again. One day in August, 1927, his wife and daughter went into Strasbourg from their home in the Black Forest to visit a dentist, and there they ran across him quite unexpectedly!

Schweitzer had prepared the way for his work on the Pauline mysticism by publishing in 1911 a critical study of Pauline interpretation, as a continuation of his critical history of the Life of Jesus. He felt it incumbent on him to trace, from the standpoint he had reached, the pathway that leads from Jesus to the history of dogma; and the primary task was to define the position of St. Paul. Does Paul represent the first stage of the Hellenizing process, or is his thought to be recognized as purely Jewish and eschatological? To this latter alternative, Schweitzer's book on *Paul and his Interpreters* points, and now after twenty years the purely Jewish and eschatological character of Paul's thought is reaffirmed and explained.

Schweitzer maintains that the Pauline mysticism is not a being-in-God mysticism, like that of Greek thought, but solely a being-in-Christ mysticism. We shall become sons of God after the Parousia. Nor is the Pauline mysticism a static partaking of the spiritual life of Christ; it is a real co-experiencing of His dying and rising again. And it differs from the Hellenistic mysticism, which is the mysticism of regeneration. In the Hellenistic conception, the dying and rising again is a single experience undergone in the act of initiation, or at most

revived from time to time with the repetition of the initiatory act, whereas for Paul it is continuous in the believer, who is 'always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake.'

But, according to Schweitzer, the Pauline mysticism has this in common with the Hellenistic mysticism, that it is sacramental. Against Deissmann's sharp denial he maintains that Paul regards Baptism as the one way of salvation in Christ. It is with Baptism that the dying and rising with Christ begins. And the Lord's Meal effects fellowship with the Christ who died and rose again, being thus in meaning very different from the Last Supper at Jerusalem.

If Schweitzer be right, Paul's significance is reduced and his importance lessened for the interval between the gospel of Jesus and the Catholic Church. For, during that interval, as a matter of history, the Pauline association of Baptism with the Jewish notion of resurrection yielded to the Johannine and Greek view of Baptism as a sacrament of regeneration. Even so, Paul's part and influence remain, in Schweitzer's view, very great. Through his eschatological mysticism and sacramentalism Paul gave to the Christian faith a *form* in which it could be Hellenized. The Hellenization of Christianity by the Asia Minor Theology (Ignatius, Justin, and the author of the Johannine writings) consisted in taking over the Pauline Christ-mysticism as the proper formulation of the Christian doctrine of redemption, but giving it for *content*, not the Pauline conception of the dying and rising again with Christ, but the Hellenistic conception of receiving the Spirit of Christ in the sacraments. To say with Deissmann that the Gospel and Epistles of John show the most thorough understanding of the Pauline mysticism is, alleges Schweitzer, as absurd as it would be to say that Beethoven is the best interpreter of J. S. Bach.

There are critical and exegetical assumptions involved here, particularly with regard to the Johannine writings, which I shall not pause to discuss. I would simply point out that Schweitzer succeeds in bridging the gulf between Jesus and Paul which had been created by liberalism, but that he does so by representing Paul—as formerly he had represented Jesus—as dominated by the forms of the Jewish Eschatology. The justness of those representations I do not here consider.

There is a difference, however, continues Schweitzer, between the eschatologies of Jesus and Paul. It goes back to the fact that whereas with

Jesus the general resurrection takes place, as in the Books of Daniel and Enoch, at the beginning of the Messianic kingdom, with Paul, who adheres to the scribal tradition of the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra, it is placed at the end. But now comes Paul's original contribution to Eschatology. He conceives the idea of another resurrection, which has been ushered in by the resurrection of Jesus, and is taking place before the coming of the Messianic kingdom, and thus before the general resurrection which shall follow. With the resurrection of Jesus the powers of the world to come were already at work in the world, although the coming of the Messiah Himself had been delayed. Believers were experiencing through their mystical union with Christ, with whom they were dead and risen again, a springtime of supernatural life, although elsewhere the winter of natural existence still reigned.

Paul, then, shares with Jesus the eschatological outlook and expectation, but the difference is in the hour in which the world-clock strikes. Jesus is listening for the stroke; for Paul it has already sounded. Or to change the metaphor, both are looking towards the same mountain-range; but while Jesus beholds it lying before Him, Paul already stands upon it, and its first slopes are behind him. And since all Paul's conceptions are set in the framework of the Jewish Eschatology, those who labour to explain him on the basis of Hellenism are like a man who should fetch water from a long distance in leaky watering-cans in order to water a garden which is beside a stream.

Thus Schweitzer not only brings Jesus and Paul more closely together (at the same time removing them farther from us), but also defines and sharpens the problem of the relation between Paul and that Asia Minor Theology which became the doctrine of the Christian Church.

Such, then, is the achievement of this remarkable man. We are indebted to him for thoughtful and penetrating studies in ethics and the theory of civilization, for masterly and incisive interpretations of the life of Jesus and the mind of St. Paul, and for the fruits of highly technical research in the music of J. S. Bach; and his professional records and observations will prove of considerable value to the student of tropical medicine. But he stands out pre-eminently as a great humanitarian. And I like to remember that the Spirit which inspires and sustains his heroic labours is none other than the Spirit of Christ.

Who Founded the Church at Rome?

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE A. BARTON, PH.D., D.D., LL.D., UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA AND
PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL.

PROFESSOR BACON'S¹ article 'Andronicus,' published in the April number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. xlii. p. 300 ff.), is most interesting and suggestive. Professor Bacon has rescued Andronicus from an oblivion that for centuries has overwhelmed him, and brought him out into the field of vision where students may at least realize his probable importance, though they may not be able fully to supply the details of a career that was evidently of considerable prominence in the early Church. It may well be doubted, however, whether the veteran professor at Yale has in all respects rightly reconstructed the events which made Andronicus and Junias 'of note among the Apostles.' A view different from that of Professor Bacon seems more probable to at least one student.

Before elaborating the point in question, however, the writer would like to express his agreement with Professor Bacon and other scholars who maintain that St. Paul, while at Ephesus, was subjected to an imprisonment which seriously endangered his life. There are in the New Testament a number of references to such an imprisonment, and, although each one is individually somewhat obscure, the combined evidence of them, when they are all collected, is most impressive; and the hypothesis of such an imprisonment goes far to solve a number of problems connected with the life of St. Paul. The tendency, however, of the scholars who advocate the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment is to overload that imprisonment by attempting to crowd into it most of the later literary activities of the great Apostle. Thus Professor Clayton R. Bowen in his various articles in the *American Journal of Theology*² and the *Journal of Biblical Literature*,³ and Professor George S. Duncan in his book *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* (New York, 1930), would have us believe that all the Epistles that have usually been assigned to St. Paul's Roman imprisonment were written while St. Paul was a prisoner at Ephesus. The Apostle was at Ephesus but three years (A.D. 54-57), and the greater part of that time must have been occupied in evangelistic

work. The imprisonment must have been of comparatively short duration, although the events connected with it endangered both St. Paul's life and apparently also that of Aquila and Priscilla. With these larger questions of the Ephesian imprisonment, however, the present writer is not concerned.

The document which it seems impossible rightly to connect with Ephesus is the sixteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Professor Bacon assumes, with Schulz, Professor Deissmann, and others, that the sixteenth chapter of Romans has no place in that Epistle and constitutes a letter of commendation to the Church at Ephesus of a certain Phoebe of Cenchreæ. The basis on which this assumption is made is, in the judgment of the present writer, altogether too slender. It rests upon the two facts that Epānetus is said in v.⁵ to be 'the first-fruits of Asia' and upon the fact that Aquila and Priscilla who are greeted in v.³ were shortly before this time at Ephesus (see Ac 18^{18, 26}). Formerly it was urged that 2 Ti 4¹⁹ gave evidence that they were at Ephesus a few years after the Epistle to the Romans was written, but now that the Pastoral Epistles are no longer regarded as Pauline, and the few Pauline verses in 2 Ti 4 are probably to be assigned to the Ephesian imprisonment of St. Paul, which had been concluded before the Epistle to the Romans was written, the argument for the Ephesian destination of Ro 16, based on the names of Aquila and Priscilla, loses much of its force. True, Professor Bacon in discovering second-century evidence in the Gnostic Acts of John connecting the name of Andronicus with Ephesus adds a third item of possible proof, but, as will be pointed out shortly, in the judgment of the writer, these considerations are outweighed by other and more weighty considerations and find a better explanation on another hypothesis.

Those who maintain the Ephesian destination of Ro 16 overlook the many and weighty arguments which connect that chapter with Rome. In Ro 16¹⁰, for example, greetings are sent to 'them who are of the household of Aristobulus.' As Lightfoot⁴ long ago pointed out, the household of Aristobulus,⁵ the brother of Herod Agrippa I., son

¹ The article by Professor Barton was written before the death of Professor B. W. Bacon. We hope to publish shortly an article by Professor Moffatt on Dr. Bacon's work.

² Vol. xxiv. 112-135.

³ Vol. xliii. 177-206.

⁴ See Lightfoot's *Philippians*, 171 ff.

⁵ Josephus, *Antiquities*, xviii. v. 4.

of Herod the Great's son Aristobulus, is probably intended. We know that this Aristobulus passed his life in Rome, maintaining his own establishment there. That this household is referred to is made probable by the fact that a greeting immediately follows to 'Herodion my kinsman.' From the pages of the New Testament, Apocrypha, and Josephus we hear of some nine different people who bore the name of Aristobulus, but none of them was connected in any way with Asia Minor. They were all connected with Palestine or Egypt, and while two of them can be connected with Rome, it is entirely gratuitous to assume that there was a household of Aristobulus in Ephesus. Secondly, Sanday and Headlam¹ have shown in their comments on Ro 16 that the names of Aquila and Priscilla, or Prisca, are found on Roman gravestones and that many of the other names mentioned in this chapter, including that of Epænetus,² mentioned above, and even that of Andronicus, are also paralleled in Latin funerary inscriptions in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.³ The evidence, therefore, connecting the chapter with Rome far outweighs all the arguments that can be amassed connecting the chapter with Asia.

Another consideration which, in the judgment of the writer, has weight, but which the advocates of the Ephesian destination of the Epistle overlook, is the impossibility of accounting for the attachment of the chapter to the Epistle to the Romans, if its destination was originally Ephesus. These facts lead the present writer to believe that the chapter is an integral part of the Epistle to the Romans and that, if we reconstruct the historical situation in the light of such facts as we have, its place in the Epistle to the Romans can not only be fully justified, but light will be shed upon one of the most interesting but obscure problems in early Church history.

In Ac 18³ we are told that Aquila and Priscilla were Jews of Pontus, and had recently come to Corinth from Italy because Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome. This expulsion of the Jews from Rome, although not mentioned either by Tacitus or Josephus, is fully corroborated by Suetonius (Claudius 25). True,

Dio Cassius (lx. 6), in referring to what was most probably the same edict, states that the Jews were not expelled, because of the difficulty of carrying such an order into effect on account of their great numbers. That such an edict was issued, however, has been accepted as an historical fact by such scholars as Mommsen, Lightfoot, Wendt, O. Holtzmann, Blass, Turner, Knowling, and Ramsay. Even if the edict were not fully carried out, and all Jews were not compelled to migrate from Rome, the right of public assembly was denied them; and many of them did, like Aquila and Priscilla, leave the capital because deprived of the full exercise of their religious privileges. Wendt rightly dated this edict in A.D. 49 or 50.

It is clear to every reader of the Acts of the Apostles that Christianity during the Apostolic Age spread mainly through the synagogue. In the synagogues of the Diaspora the Apostles and first missionaries, who were mainly Jews, found congregations ready at hand which, by education and religious training, were prepared to understand the Christian message as the heathen could not. It is altogether improbable, therefore, that Christianity spread to Rome while the edict of Claudius was in force. Claudius died in the summer of A.D. 54. Nero succeeded him in October of that year. Accordingly the Church at Rome, which, as the Epistle to the Romans fully testifies, was largely composed of Jews, could not have been founded before the beginning of the reign of Nero. The Epistle to the Romans was composed either at the end of the year A.D. 57, or the beginning of the year 58. Within the period, then, from October 54 to the end of the year 57 the Church at Rome was founded and had assumed such considerable proportions that St. Paul, recognizing the influential position that it was sure to assume, thought it best, since at that moment he was pledged to go to Jerusalem on another mission, to set forth to them the type of gospel which he preached. The time, then, in which the Church at Rome must have been founded is almost exactly contemporary with the three years of St. Paul's residence at Ephesus. As Jews would naturally be slow to return, after Nero's accession, until sufficient time had elapsed to enable them to gauge Nero's policy toward them before they returned to Rome, the founding of the Church there would surely fall in the last half of the period mentioned. In other words, in the years 56 or 57.

If now by the use of the historical imagination we attempt to reconstruct the course of events made probable by the facts before us, it would be something as follows. St. Paul was thrown into

¹ *International Critical Commentary*.

² Though the 'first-fruits of Asia,' Epænetus need not have spent the rest of his life there.

³ While the names in the *Corpus* are not those of the identical individuals mentioned in Ro 16, their presence there is proof that they were names actually borne by Romans. No such proof that they were borne by Ephesians exists.

prison at Ephesus perhaps in the year 55 or 56. Andronicus and Junias, who as Bacon has shown, were probably in Ephesus at the time, were imprisoned with him. Aquila and Priscilla, who were in Ephesus also, voluntarily endangered their lives in behalf of the prisoners. For reasons which we cannot now clearly trace, the prisoners all regained their freedom, and the lives of Priscilla and Aquila were spared. We know that not long after this occurred St. Paul left Ephesus (Ac 20¹). It is altogether probable that Andronicus, Junias, Aquila, and Priscilla would do the same. Aquila and Priscilla had formerly resided in Rome. Finding it safer to leave Ephesus, what more probable than that they should return to Rome?

We are now in a position to appreciate the suggestion which it is the aim of this paper to present. That suggestion is this: that Andronicus and Junias were the first Christians to make their way to Rome and that it was they who were the founders of the Church at Rome. St. Paul

speaks of them as 'of note among the Apostles.' Bacon's suggestion that they were the real founders of the Church at Ephesus seems in contradiction to the implications of Ac 18¹⁸-19⁹, where it is implied that St. Paul and Aquila and Priscilla were the real founders of the Church at Ephesus. If Andronicus and Junias were the first to carry the gospel to Rome and were the real founders of the Church in the capital, that in itself would make them of note among the Apostles, and St. Paul's mention of the fact that they were of note in the Apostolic circle would be a delicate way, in writing to that Church, of referring to their pioneer work at Rome.

To the writer the historical reconstruction just sketched seems much more believable than that of Professor Bacon in his article 'Andronicus.' But for Professor Bacon's article, however, his eyes would not have been opened to what now seems to him the probable solution of one of the most important problems in New Testament history.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Never look at the Clock!

BY THE REVEREND J. S. STEWART, B.D., ABERDEEN.

'Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord.'
—Col 3²³.

EDISON the inventor was once asked what advice he would give to a young man beginning his career. 'Tell him never to look at the clock,' was the answer. Do you think that was good advice? Certainly we wish that some people would look at the clock more than they do. People who preach sermons, for instance. Sometimes there is a big clock right in the middle of the back gallery of a church, where very few people (except the preacher) can possibly see it; but he gets very little chance to forget it, specially if it is one of the kind that strikes the hour. In the old days before clocks were invented, there was often an hour-glass in the pulpit, and as you watched the sand slowly running through, you could calculate how near or how far the end of the sermon was; though occasionally the preacher might upset your calculations and your hopes by turning the glass over and beginning again. Yes, we do wish some people would look

at the clock more than they do. Perhaps at home they wish that about you, when the knock comes at seven o'clock and you turn over and say, 'Just ten minutes more,' and somehow the ten minutes become half an hour and then there's a dreadful scramble. There are people who really ought to look at the clock more than they do. What can Edison have been meaning?

Besides, some people *must* look at the clock, if they are to do their work properly. A railway signalman, for instance, has to keep the trains on his section of the line running up to time; *he* must look at the clock. Or take a referee in a football match or a hockey match. You know what it feels like to see your favourite team sweeping down on the enemy goal in the last minute of the game. You wish fervently that the referee would forget the time. But no, he has his watch in his hand, and in a moment the whistle for 'Time' will be blown. The referee must 'look at the clock.' Or think of your school exams. A clock or a watch is useful then, isn't it? Suppose there are six questions to answer, and an hour to do it in. And suppose you grow so keen about one particular question and can write so much about it that the

hour is gone before you have even looked at the other five—that is bad generalship. The better way is to divide your hour up, and have time for all the six. Look at the clock! What *did* Edison mean?

'Tell him never to look at the clock!' He meant that the one way to succeed in this world is to throw yourself into things so whole-heartedly that you will forget all about time. He meant that the one way to fail is to do just the amount you must do and never a hand's turn more.

Here is a boy who is going to be an engineer. If he is the right sort of boy for that career, you will notice one or two things about him. You will notice that he has plenty of hobbies, mechanical hobbies mostly, for his spare time. You will notice that his face lights up eagerly when you talk to him about wireless or motors. You will notice that he enjoys reading 'How it Works' as much as any detective story. That means his heart is in it. He never looks at the clock.

Or here is a girl who is going to be a teacher. She doesn't fling her Shakespeare down when the bit of preparation for to-morrow is finished, with a 'Thank goodness that's over!' She doesn't scamp through her essay, wondering just how short an essay she dare send in. Her heart is in it. She isn't looking at the clock. That is how success comes. That is how life grows great.

That was Jesus' way. Of course there were no clocks nineteen hundred years ago. But if there had been, we know what would have happened. Would Jesus have looked at the clock? His life was the busiest life ever lived on this earth: people came crowding to Him for help continually, and He had time for them all. Early morning and late night found Him living for God and men with all His heart and strength. Never was the hour too late for Him to receive a troubled soul, never was the hour too early for Him to rise and pray. It was the will of God—first and last and all the time. No, certainly our Master never 'looked at the clock.'

Let me add this. Don't have too much of the clock in your prayers. St. Teresa confessed that in her earlier days she used to have her hour-glass near her when she was on her knees, and she would keep glancing at it during her prayers, wishing that the sand would run out more quickly and let her rise and go. But you remember how Jesus, praying in the garden on the night of His betrayal, rebuked His disciples. 'Could ye not watch with me one hour?' He said. I wonder if to some of us the Master's word is 'Could ye not watch with Me

five minutes?' Don't stint God! Don't throw Him a few grudging moments. Never mind the clock. 'Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord.'

The Surprise Train.

By THE REVEREND ARTHUR W. ROBSON, M.A., WICK

'Abraham . . . went out, not knowing whither he went.'—He 11⁸.

All you boys and many of you girls are interested in railways, and some of you may have noticed in the papers recently that the Great Western Railway have invented a new kind of train, called the Surprise Train. You are told when it starts, and where it starts from; you pay your fare and take your seat; the whistle blows, and you set off for—you don't know where! The engine-driver and the guard even are not told the destination until the very minute before the train starts. So off you go into the unknown, and what might otherwise be a dull railway journey becomes a glorious adventure.

This writer to the Hebrews says that something like that happened to Abraham: he 'went out, not knowing whither he went.' And I think he must have gone gladly and bravely, with the feeling that he was entering upon a wonderful adventure. For there is always a fascination about something which is unknown; there would be little fun in playing a hard football match if you knew what the result was going to be before the kick-off. But because the result is unknown, uncertain till the final whistle blows, you play your best. The uncertainty adds excitement to the whole game.

What are you going to do to-morrow? 'I'm going back to school,' you say. Yes, but is that really an answer to the question? Whom are you going to meet? What is going to happen to you? What sort of day are you going to have? 'I don't know,' you reply. Exactly. You are going on a Surprise Train. Like Abraham even, you are going out, and you don't know where you are going. It's all an unknown adventure.

But there may be something about the adventure which you don't like; you are going to meet the unknown, and the uncertainty may be making you just a little bit afraid. That is always the way something which is unknown may fascinate and interest us—but at the same time it may make us afraid.

Suppose you went on that Surprise Train, and it stopped at a large town which was strange to you. You would get out on the platform and make your way into the streets, and the crowds of strange

people hurrying past would make you feel ill at ease; you would be afraid to go very far in case you lost yourself. Your journey on the Surprise Train would be turned into a rather terrifying experience, and you would wish you were safe home in the old familiar surroundings. But suppose your father was with you? Then you would feel really different; the unknown town would excite you; you would have time to look into the shop windows; you would be interested in the large buildings; the crowds of people and the busy streets would both add to the thrill. And you would come to the end of the day feeling that it had all been a glorious adventure, that it had been worth while to go out, not knowing where you were going.

There's a text in Proverbs which says, 'Thou knowest not what a day may bring forth.' That is just the Bible's way of saying that we are all on the Surprise Train. We don't know what is going to happen to us to-morrow, and because we don't know, we may be afraid of what it will hold for us. But there's a way of going through life which, instead of making us feel afraid, will thrill us and make us feel that we are going on a splendid adventure. And that is just to have our Father with us all the time, and to keep close to Him; and we have Him, for He has promised that He will be with us whenever we ask Him. That was Abraham's secret; he went out, not knowing whether he went, but knowing that God was leading him; so he went on his adventure bravely, knowing that he was safe.

The Christian Year.

TRINITY SUNDAY.

Vision and Service.

I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne. . . . And I heard the voice of the Lord. . . . Then I said, Here I; send me.—Is 6^{1. 8. 9} (R.V.).

Isaiah's superb account of his vision of God has long been a selected lesson for Trinity Sunday, and the revised lectionary it remains in its old place, the message of the Trinity Festival is near akin to the prophet's vision. The doctrine to which Trinity Sunday recalls us is, after all, only an attempt, in the face of all the difficulties, to give ordered expression to the Christian vision of God revealed as Father, Son, and Spirit. There is no hint of such ordered expression in Isaiah's account of what he saw and heard. We do not nowadays read in

that sense the thrice-repeated 'Holy' of the cry of the seraph as Isaiah heard it, though it accords well with it. Isaiah says nothing, because he knew nothing, of Trinity in Unity; but he does tell us that he spiritually saw God, and we know that his vision of God had such vividness and compelling power that it shaped the whole of his after-life to God's service.

'The more I think of it,' said Ruskin, 'I find this conclusion more impressed upon me,—that the greatest thing a human soul ever does in this world is to see something, and tell what it saw in a plain way. Hundreds of people can talk for one who can think, but thousands can think for one who can see. To see clearly is poetry, prophecy, and religion,—all in one.' On all sides men to-day are straining their eyes for fresh vision. The War let loose so many questions and upset so many established things that there are few intelligent people now who are not conscious of the need of it. Of course it is a dominant fact in a great seat of learning. But one of the most hopeful facts of the life of our great cities to-day is the extraordinary craving of labour for education. Not as a mere means to power, though that is there, but as a means to an increase of seeing the truth of things, and so of a fuller life. And those who know the world far afield tell us of the amazingly widespread desire in the races of the East, and even among the child-races of Africa, for the knowledge which we in the West can give them. 'Give us vision.' That cry is certainly a cry for much more than for the knowledge of how to make life more interesting and comfortable. It is a cry for a vision of the Unseen in this world of sense and time, a cry for God and things eternal.

That is one fact whose influence we cannot fail to see at work around us. And with it there is another equally evident. The world to-day resounds with the demand for service. It never stood in greater need of devotion and the practical pursuit of great ideals. It is too dangerous a world for anything worth preserving to be safe in it without the resolute self-giving of devoted men and women. Any man with his eyes open must needs agree with that great pioneer of women's education, Miss Dorothea Beale, when she said that 'Service is the rent we pay for our room on earth.' We have grown to the conviction that there is no room in our world for any one who imagines that he has inherited or can purchase the freehold of some place in life that carries with it no liability to give the world something in exchange for his tenure of it. And we feel also the truth of Renan's saying that

'the stability of our institutions turns upon the amount of sacrifice that is built into them.'

And yet, with all this, with our lip-service to the duty and the ideal of service, the world is being starved for the lack of the practice of it. In every direction and sphere of life there is a call for the worker who takes his life in both hands and offers it to God and his fellow-men. And the service of ideals cannot go very far before it becomes a sacrifice. Every ideal has its price, and before it can become practical the inevitable payment must be made. In one of the greatest of all novels, *The Brothers Karamazov*, of the Russian Dostoevsky, there is a trial scene in which the prosecuting advocate ruthlessly dissects the character and motives of the prisoner, Dmitri Karamazov, who stands arraigned on the charge of murdering his father. 'He can be carried off his feet,' runs the prosecutor's indictment, 'by noble ideals, but only if they come of themselves, if they fall from heaven for him, if they need not be paid for. He dislikes paying for anything, but is very fond of receiving, and that's so with him in everything.' We have not to travel very far to-day in politics and religion, or indeed in anything, before we meet men of that kind. And we are always meeting the same thing in our own souls.

What is there, then, which is strong enough to discipline us to the practical service of others but the vision of God? There is so much in the world and in ourselves which invites to selfishness that for the majority of men the temptation proves all too strong. We may successfully repel the worst things which conscience condemns, the appeal of the world, the flesh, and the devil to follow the desires of the senses in the quest of a false freedom, though nearly all men at some time or other have to meet and master it. We may do that and still lie open to the subtler appeal to be false to the higher things by which alone man really lives. Good causes flame up and become popular for a time, and many acclaim them. But when progress is seen to be slow, and they come up against the obstinate blindness of mankind to its own best interests, the fire in those causes dies down and burns low for lack of the support and inspiration of a living and abiding purpose and enthusiasm in men to support them and see them through. Only a vision like that of Isaiah can sustain the burden of a life's vocation, and inspire a man to renew again and again the consecration which it always brings with it—'Here am I, send me.'

And so on Trinity Sunday there comes to us this call of God to an enlightened and enduring service ;

the call of God revealed, not as to the young prophet in the Temple, but in the fuller, clearer light of Christ. Get right about God, get right with God and the way of vision will become the way to service.

We know the paths wherein our feet should press
Across our hearts are written Thy decrees,
Yet now, O Lord, be merciful to bless
With more than these.

Grant us the will to fashion as we feel,
Grant us the strength to labour as we know,
Grant us the purpose, ribbed and edged with steel
To strike the blow.

Knowledge we ask not—knowledge Thou hast lent
But, Lord, the will—there lies our bitter need,
Give us to build above the deep intent
The deed, the deed.²

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Message of the Name.

'Thou shalt call his name Jesus : for he shall save his people from their sins.'—Mt 1st.

When a Hebrew father and mother chose a name for their child, they enshrined in the word a momentous experience, or a gracious providence, a pledge of loyalty, or an impassioned desire. Rachel who lay a-dying called her child Benoni—the son of my sorrow. Moses, in Horeb, unpacked the longing of his exiled heart when he called his firstborn Gershom—a stranger here. David poured both his penitence and his meek gratitude into the name of Solomon—at peace. So, when Mary's Babe lay in her bosom she named Him Jesus, as He was named of the angel. The name was the index to the prophecy of what He was to be to men—'he shall save his people from their sins.'

How does Jesus save His people from their sins? A man's sins—every single transgression and the whole course and current of evil both of heart and life—present themselves to the conscience in three aspects. First: *sin is a fact, with its issues and consequences of a fact*. We leave the years of our life behind us, but the deeds done, the body are as real as, and more enduring than, the everlasting hills. Second: *sin is a moral and spiritual condition*. The evidence for that truth is with us in every moment of our lives. Third: *sin is a habit, under whose tyranny we are all held*. Jesus has come to deal with the fact, the condition and the habit of sin.

¹ F. B. Macnutt, *From Chaos to God*, 144.

² John Drinkwater.

1. Every man knows the reality of the fact of sin. Every man has played the fool, thoughtlessly or wilfully or wantonly. Every man has left the highway of truth and purity and honour to wander in forbidden fields. Every man has been traitor to his covenant and disloyal to his vow. Every man has missed the mark, and failed to rise to his high calling and to achieve his destiny. Whether our iniquities or transgressions are written in any book of the eternal counsel or not, they are written in the indelible record of our own past.

Look at this truth in some of the marked instances in Scripture. Think of Joseph's brethren in the hour when, unrecognized by them, he was asking eager questions and lavishing his strange kindnesses, as they endure an almost unsupportable anguish for that sin which they thought remained hidden to men. Think of David, seeing in the disorder of his own household, and in Absalom's daring and wanton outbreak, the issues of that fall which he had been false both to truth and honour. Think of Ahab, walking in the cool of the day in Jezebel's garden, revolving his pleasant plans for the enhancement of its beauty, when suddenly Elijah meets him face to face, and his sin rises like an apparition. Who does not understand these proofs of the fact? We think with a pathetic sorrow-feeling of that man who looked up and saw in the corner of a building in a growing town in one of our oversea dominions the name of a home in his own native city. In the instant the memory of a deed of self-indulgence committed within that home—a deed he thought dead and forgotten—stood out in accusing reality, and brought a cry of pain to his lips. If Jesus is to save us from our sins, we must deal with the fact.

2. The rebel thought and evil deed are not merely facts of history. They are symptoms of a moral and spiritual condition. That condition of soul was expressed in the Old Testament in a figure whose power to realize its loathsomeness and deadliness has never waned. That figure is leprosy.

The New Testament writers view this moral and spiritual condition with eyes as full of condemnation as the fact of guilt. The terms they use, by their variety, express their detestation and dread. Paul calls it the carnal mind which is enmity against God, as though every man lodged a defiant rebel in the secret of his soul. James lays it bare as a fire within the moral nature which has been kindled of hell, whose flames dart out in bitter burning on the tongue. Peter thinks of it as an inner world of ravening appetites. John sees it as a lawlessness—a state of anarchy—in which love itself has

been desecrated. The writer to the Hebrews regards it as a deeply rooted weed, hidden in the soil, which rises up in its season to pollute and poison the garden of the Lord. But Jesus always uses the perfect and most fitting image. He speaks of this condition as a spring or well, out of which there flow the foul issues of men's deeds. 'Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies; these are the things which defile a man.' Who has not known the defilement of this stream?

But the height of this offending is not realized until we understand what this condition is in the light of God's countenance. The real root and focus of our sinful state is its alienation from God, and its antagonism to His holiness. In the letters of George Meredith there is one whose poignancy of feeling exceeds that of every other. It is a letter to his son after years of alienation. The young man had fallen ill, and was reported to be in need, and his father wrote him: 'We have been long estranged, my dear boy, and I awake from it with a shock that wrings me. The elder should be the first to break through such divisions, for he knows best the tenure and the nature of life. But our last parting gave me the idea that you did not care for me, and I am so driven by work that I do not contend well with misapprehension of me and disregard.' Meredith sets his pain in the gentle and reticent words of a master of style. But he reveals this truth that a son's wrongdoing, and the shame of his life, do not smite a father's heart with so keen a blow as alienation and antagonism. It is that alienation and that antagonism which is the very essence of our sinful condition, and that smites the heart of God. If Jesus is to save us from our sins, He must deal with this moral and spiritual condition of the soul.

3. All who spend their strength in winning men and women for Christ have times of disappointment. They see a man confessing his faith with a high rapture, or they mark a woman's new-born devotion, and they rejoice in the clear note of steadfast assurance in their speech. Yet they are amazed to find that these ardent souls slip and fall, and they wonder if the work of grace has been real. They forget that sin is a habit with its power. A man who has become a victim to strong drink has taken his vow of abstinence with tears of penitence. He has set his name to his pledge with deep emotion, and has begun to walk in a new strength and liberty. For a month all went well. Then he was seized in the grip of his old habit. Few understood the battle he had fought. Few

knew the physical torture as the craving of his thirst assailed him. He fell. But he was not insincere, he was the victim of the tyranny of a habit.

One reason why Jesus was so gentle in His judgments and so patient in His dealing, both with passion-driven sinners and with His own erring disciples, was His knowledge of the power of the habit of sin. Yet if we charge our hearts to be forbearing and forgiving to our fellow-men, we must be resolute with ourselves. An evil habit must be exorcised. Its power can be broken. For Christ came not only to take away our guilt, and to renew our wills, but to break the power of cancelled sin.

How, then, does Jesus save us from our sins? With the fact itself nothing can be done. But the real poignancy of the fact of sin is its guilt. Nothing else in reality can be dealt with, or needs to be dealt with. We cannot enter into any one's fellowship, or receive and reciprocate their love, unless the past and its evil which has sundered us be forgiven. Reconciliation is the first need of every sinful man. When we are able to believe in God's forgiveness, because we know that the sins of the world have been borne by Christ on His cross, and that pardon now waits for every penitent, we can enter into the peace of a lowly self-surrender.

How does Christ save us from the moral and spiritual condition of sin? He has come to deal not only with our past, but to heal us in the core of our being, by the power of His regenerating Spirit. He has come to create a new heart within us, to call us to repentance, and to quicken us to that faith which brings us into a new attitude toward God. He has come to renew our will, so that, however hard may be our battle, we are intent on keeping the commandments of God.

How does Christ deal with the habit of sin? What moral question has more tormented universal humanity? Not by Oriental contemplation in its selfish idleness, not by the starving of the natural affections of our body which is God's, not by ascetic methods of prayer and obedience, but only by a complete surrender to Jesus, and an unbroken fellowship with Him, will the power of sin be quelled. In one of Shakespeare's sonnets he describes a mood in which sad remembrance, and a sense of loss and a lack of things desired, move him to tears. But he catches up his heart with the words:

But if the while I think on thee, dear friend,
All losses are restor'd and sorrows end.

So we can take not only our sad remembrances, our sorrows, and our lack of things desired, but

our weakness and our fear, and every need of our soul to Christ, and, keeping ourselves in the love of God, come forth from every battle with the habit of sin more than conquerors through Him who loves us.¹

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

'He maketh me to lie down in Green Pastures.'

'He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters.'—Ps 23².

The very beauty of this picture may only serve to hide from us the depths of its meaning. We seem to see the shepherd walking before his flock through fields decked out with green and gold and all the glory of a generous God, coming at last to the silent pool with the reflection of the sky sleeping in its heart, and it seems as though it were for the glory of the summer and the sleeping beauty of the pool that the sheep followed the shepherd. And indeed, it is for that reason that many do seek the Good Shepherd. They think of religion not as a necessity but as a luxury, not as life, but as a kind of addition to life which it is very nice to have but which we could quite well do without. But it is not for the green and gold of summer fields that the sheep seeks to find them, but because they are good to eat. It is not for the sleeping beauty of the heart of silent waters that the flock follows to find them, but because they are good to drink. It is not luxury that they ask of the shepherd, but the bare necessities. And we cannot make too sure of this, that religion, communion with God, is not luxury but a necessity for the soul. We are hungry headed, hungry hearted, hungry souled, and this intellectual, emotional, and spiritual hunger is as tyrannous and terrible if it be not satisfied as the hunger of the body.

Many of us are not conscious fully of our *hunger of the head*, and yet it is there. Life challenges us continually—challenges our curiosity, our courage, our self-respect. It flings a thousand questions at us, and until we begin to die, and we begin to die when we begin to give it up, there is a passionate desire within us to answer the challenge and find the meaning of life. This is the hunger of the head, the hunger for truth and reality, and it must be fed.

Now whatever be the truth that the mind seeks, it can only move towards it along one road, and of that road there are three stages. The first is wonder, the second is vision, and the third is venture. There is no other road to the palace of

¹ W. M. Clow, *The Evangel of the Strait Gate*, 25.

truth but that. Sir Almroth Wright has declared that a pain in the mind is the prelude to all discovery. That is an illuminating phrase. Wonder is a pain in the mind.

Animals, despite their sufferings, appear to be content; man, despite his blessings and his supremacy over all animals, is perpetually in discontent. That is why people who have not yet begun to live in any human sense of that word appear often to be happier than the saints; they have not begun to wonder, to ask questions and to be sad, they are content to muddle through anyhow.

The triumph of the scientist and the triumph of the saint are both born from the trouble of the mind. John Bunyan, brooding over the problem of his soul, and Johann Kepler, brooding over the problem of the stars, are alike in this: they are troubled in mind, and the only relief that can come to them must come of a moment of vision. One saw the Cross, the other saw the law of gravity, and the result of both visions was the coming of peace. The triumphant moment in the life of the scientist is the moment when he conceives his great hypothesis which gives meaning to a large number of apparently disconnected and disordered facts over which he has been brooding. The triumphant moment of the saint is the moment of his conversion when he sees in his Lord the meaning of the disconnected and disorderly experiences which go to make up human life. And when they have passed through their moment of vision, there remains for both the great task of implicit obedience to that which they have seen; for the scientist this means the testing of his hypothesis, for the saint, the living of his faith.

The Christian faith is the great religious hypothesis, in it the Christian sees the meaning of life. The scientific hypothesis eases the pain of the mind that is always asking as it looks at and wonders about this strange universe: 'How did it come to be?' 'The religious hypothesis eases the pain in the mind that, as it looks upon the universe and wonders, is always asking: 'Why did it come to be?'

In Christ born in Bethlehem, crucified on Calvary, conquering death, rising again, there is revealed to us the meaning of life in terms of perfect personality, the only terms which could be ultimately satisfactory. The great faith says that the meaning of the vast and terrible process of evolution is God suffering in and through man to bring him to glory. Evolution is ascension through sacrifice to perfection.

There are still problems that baffle, mysteries that are not yet cleared up, but it is no longer a

hopeless trouble; we become sure that faith in Christ accepted by the intellect will solve for us all problems in the world and out of it at last. So the Good Shepherd makes us to lie down in green pastures and leads us beside the still waters; sets us free to think in peace.

But there is not only a hunger of the head, there is a *hunger of the heart*, nor can the two be separated as easily as men suppose. The head will not cease from hungering until the heart is satisfied. There is no more barren form of idolatry than the worship of the intellect. It is essentially idolatry, for an idol is something that claims a power apart from God, which it cannot possess. Man has triumphed over Nature by means of what he calls 'scientific thinking,' that is, thinking as far as possible divorced from feeling. And this has led him to the belief that feeling and thought are in some way essentially opposed, and that the only way to think straight is to destroy feeling.

But the heart is really stronger than the head in every one of us whenever it comes to things that really matter, and the stronger our heads are the more astounding and ultimately unreasonable are the means which the heart will use to satisfy itself. In the last issue it is what we love that makes us what we are, and what we are that determines actually the worth or worse than worthlessness of what we think. The supreme question for us all is, What do we want? What do we love? and it is here that the Good Shepherd comes in to minister to our necessity, comes in to give us not luxuries and extras, but comes in to give us what we must have. If we pretend that we can do without it, we do but deceive ourselves. If we do not love beauty, truth, and goodness as it is in Christ Jesus, we will love some beauty, truth, and goodness of our own, some person or reality. To the making of Gods apart from Jesus there is no end.

As the late Mr. Clutton-Brock puts it: 'Our whole society now spends its superfluous energies in activities which would seem to it insane if it were not so used to them, and the causes of which it does not even attempt to understand. Consider, for instance, the energy and money we spend on games and on watching them, on contests between prize fighters, on horse racing and all kinds of gambling, on the means of rushing from place to place, and on substitutes for art, such as the cinema. We do not know why we do these things, we cannot analyse or account for the pleasures we get from them, we cannot even say whether the feeling aroused by them is pleasure; all we know is that we are like Blake's figure of a child which

stretches out its hand and cries, "I want, I want." Without knowing what our wants are we spend more and more money in satisfying them, and always the process becomes more and more expensive, being, indeed, valued because of its expense.⁷

The crucial question for the man who denies that Christ is Divine is to decide what is or who is, for man must live for something or somebody, and if not Christ, then for whom? For his country, we say. What do we mean by that? What does he want for his country? That it should be great, powerful, and rich above all others? There are many who live for that, and they are tearing God's world into pieces. For his family, we say. What does he want for his family? That it should be prosperous, comfortable, and independent? There are thousands who live for that, and they are tearing God's world into pieces. For humanity, we say. What does he want for humanity? That it should be comfortable, rich, free from sorrow and from pain? There are some few who live for that, and they are breaking their hearts and pursuing an empty dream. For any one who is working for these ends that they may be what Christ could bless, then is he touching the garment of reality, and life begins. Because we find in Him the supremely worthy object of our love, therefore He makes us to lie down in green pastures and leads us beside the still waters and satisfies the hunger of our heart.

But lastly, there is not only hunger of the head and hunger of the heart, there is *hunger of the soul*. When we have seen the truth as it is in Jesus, and seen beauty as it is blessed by Him, straightway are we brought into bitter conflict with ourselves and with the world. We are brought face to face with the mystery of ugliness and evil in ourselves and in the world.

Christ does not explain; there is no explanation of it. It can no more be explained than the writings of a lunatic. The essence of it is irrational. There is only one way of solving the problem of evil, and that is destroying it.

Just so far as we can tolerate the injustice, the cruelty, the dirt, and degradation that is in the world, just so sure can we be that we have not seen Him. The test and hallmark of the vision is the strength of our rebellion against it. If we can really rest content while men and women sleep six or seven in a bedroom, as they do in North Kensington and in Birmingham, and even in some villages; if we can rest content while men are overworked and underpaid; if we can tolerate

the waste and cruelty of war, the degradation of prostitution, we have not seen Him, we have not found our God, we are still not living but wasting life.

The Good Shepherd intensifies to the point of torture the hunger of the soul until it becomes a passion in man to make the world in which he lives as beautiful and as good as he perceives that it is meant to be; He intensifies the hunger to the point of torture that He may satisfy it by the gift of communion with Himself and the moral power that springs from that communion.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Self-Violence.

'I forced myself therefore, and offered a burnt offering.'—I S 13¹².

There is, of course, a forcing of oneself, which is legitimate and even laudable. A patient, for example, may have no appetite. 'I have no heart to eat' is his plea. But the doctor persists in his refusal to accept it. 'You must take nourishment,' he says, 'or you will die. You must force yourself to eat.' So, too, we may *force ourselves to work*.

'How often,' writes Zola, the French novelist, 'have I gone to my desk of a morning, with my head in confusion, lost, my mouth bitter, tortured by some great physical or moral anguish. And on each occasion, despite the rebellion of my sufferings, my task, after the first minute of agony, brought me relief and comfort.'

Higher still, we may *force our will to obey the leadings of conscience*. It may be said that no life can reach the heights of moral attainment in which there is not this element of holy violence. 'The kingdom of God suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.' As the salmon or the sea-trout breast their way up against the stream, and by doing so achieve the end of their being, so only he who resists the current of lower inclinations wins the true glory of life.

But while these words may thus have a good sense, the one in which Saul uses them here is the reverse of this. They are used in extenuation of what he knew to be a grave moral offence, the sin of sacrilege. Our text, therefore, brings before us *the sin of self-violence*. In King Saul's case it is done to his conscience, but there are other forms in which this grave moral injury may assume.

¹ G. A. Studdert Kennedy, *The New Man in Christ* 214.

There is, for example, *violence to the mind*. A man may force his intellect to adopt certain views or opinions which an unbiased reason tells him are untrue. This is the worst effect of religious intolerance. 'Let both grow together,' said Jesus, 'reference to the tares among the wheat, lest while ye root out the tares ye take the wheat also.' Then ecclesiastical authorities attempt to force the people to accept what their reason tells them is false, the result can only be a form of persuasion which is intellectual hypocrisy and the destruction of spiritual peace. 'They make a solitude and call it peace.' 'E pur si muove,' said Galileo, in a half whisper to himself, when the Inquisition forced him to deny that the earth moved. Persecution is out of fashion now; but there are many who force their minds still to obtain a livelihood or gain popularity which their conscience cannot approve. The teacher does it, when he teaches his children at the school what he does not believe. The minister does it, when to achieve popularity he preaches half-truths to his congregation. Carlyle was asked to do it by Jeffrey when he was urged to make his style more amenable to the popular taste.

William James, the psychologist, is the author of a famous phrase, 'the will to believe.' In one point of view it expresses a valuable truth. We can put ourselves in the way of receiving what we may call spiritual as opposed to merely scientific truth. 'If any man willeth to do my will,' said Christ, 'he shall know of the doctrine whether it is of God or whether I speak it of myself.' But 'the will to believe' means the drugging of the intellect by what Ignatius Loyola calls a prolonged spiritual discipline, so that at the end of it his intellect becomes the mere slave of his will and that will the slave of some one else, then a most serious injury is done to the mind by its possessor.

In what we falsely call the secular life, we see not a few examples of self-violence. The 'quick-change artist' in politics, the rogue in business, the purveyor of lubricity in literature, the slave of custom and convention in social life, all knew at the time, probably in a dim sort of way, what they ought to do and to be, but self-interest was too powerful for them, and they were led into a course

of violence to their better selves which has left them in the end moral or intellectual suicides.

What is true of the mind and the conscience is also true of the body. All sin is a self-violence. It is an injury done by a man to his soul. But it may also be an injury inflicted by a man upon his body. The great sins of the flesh, the sin of sensuality, the sin of intemperance, the sin of gambling, these are all sins which leave their mark most cruelly on the physical basis of life.

Professor Drummond tells of a man who was threatened with blindness and went to consult a famous physician in regard to his symptoms. The great oculist soon discovered by a course of subtle examination what the real root of the man's malady was. He was practising a certain evil habit. He asked the man frankly if it was not so. The patient, after some hesitation, had to admit that he was right. 'Then,' said the physician, 'you must give it up or you will be blind in six months.' The man said nothing, but went to the window and muttered to himself: 'Farewell then, beautiful world! Farewell, the sun and moon and stars; farewell, the trees and flowers. Farewell, the faces of men and women! For, doctor, I've tried to give this habit up times I cannot number, and I cannot do so.' He was blind in six months.

The most tragic, if not always the most criminal, form of self-violence is what we call *suicide* or *self-destruction*. Saul in after years furnished an example of this when, on the gloomy heights of Mount Gilboa, he fell upon his own sword and perished by his own hand. It may be said that in his case there was some excuse for his action, and it has been held that there are cases where suicide is justifiable. But while we do not judge others, let us be strict in judging ourselves, let us put away from our minds all specious excuses, in thinking what we should do if life were to become to us a burden that seems too heavy to be borne. Let us remember our great Master, who furnishes us a lesson in such an hour upon the Cross, who when the opiate cup was pressed to His lips in the hour of His supreme agony 'tasted thereof but would not drink.' ¹

¹ W. Mackintosh Mackay, *Our Attitude to Self*, 197.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, M.A., D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

DURING the last few months numerous reports have been coming in affecting Biblical history and chronology. The mysterious cuneiform texts, more than 3500 years old, unearthed at Ras Shamra, in Syria, by Professor Chaeffer (including fragments of vocabularies, religious texts, and public documents), and at last deciphered by Charles Vroilleaud and others, are beginning to give us a new revelation in the history of religions, and to throw considerable light on obscure words and passages in the Old Testament. In the *Poem of Môt and Aleîn*, for instance, as well as in the *Epopée of Kri*, we find mention of a god 'Naaman' (Hebrew, 'pleasantness') under circumstances which make him equivalent to Adonis, as Movers and Lagarde suspected long ago. In the case of Is 17¹⁰ ('pleasant plants'), the margin of the Revised Version thus seems to contain the true rendering, 'plantings of Adonis.' More remarkable, perhaps, is the fact that the two adjectives (*brh*, 'swift,' and *qltn*, 'crooked'), which are applied in Is 27¹ to a particularly dangerous kind of serpent called Leviathan, are the identical ones used in the Poem referred to of the same serpent, there spoken of as *Ltn*, and said to have seven heads. We know from Ps 74¹⁴ that Leviathan had several heads, but the Ras Shamra text gives us a more precise idea of this fantastic reptile, and it may be necessary to revise our ideas of it. Probably *Ltn* is its primitive name—at least it must be the most ancient known to us.

Excavation is going on at other places in Syria. At *Hamâ* (ancient Hamath) on the Orontes, Professor Harold Ingholt of the American University of Beirut has been working. This is probably the most promising Biblical site in Syria, dating back to about 3000 B.C. So far, only the Arab level has been unearthed, but, as the work proceeds, important light on Biblical history may be confidently expected. Excavation has been commenced at the important city of Calneh (about half-way between Aleppo and Alexandretta), referred to by the prophets Amos (6²) and Isaiah (10⁹) as a powerful western enemy of Assyria. The mound is known as *Chatal Hüyük*, and here the Oriental Institute of Chicago is at work. At Antioch in Syria also excavation has begun under Princeton University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the Louvre. The Director is Professor Elderkin of Princeton, and the organization is being undertaken by

Professor Fisher, who is devoting the first six months of this year to it.

Important discoveries connected with the Israelite period are being made at Samaria, under Mr. J. V. Crowfoot. The chief remains of the royal palace of Omri and Ahab, which were unearthed by Reisner more than twenty years ago, consisted of two detached groups of buildings and a tank which he identified with the 'pool of Samaria,' the whole being enclosed by a great wall of which he found traces. Present excavations show that the southern wall of the palace buildings stood on the outer edge of a terrace, from which the ground fell in perpendicular scarps (partly artificial and partly natural) down to the city wall. Both palaces, regard to dimensions, appear to have been conceived on the same scale as the great Assyrian ones. The masonry, according to Mr. Crowfoot, is by far the finest of the period which has been found in Palestine, and only that at Megiddo is at all comparable with it. Probably, like the latter, it is derived from Phœnicia, with which Ahab had intimate connexions. Five cisterns, some of them very large, have been found, including one forty-nine feet long by twenty-nine high and seven wide with thirty steps leading down to it; and a second almost as large, opening into it. An entirely new type of vessel has been discovered in some of the tombs—a large oval foot-bath of coarse red burnished ware, with a flat foot-rest raised on two pillars in the middle, exactly like the rest used by shoe-blacks. It has been found to be almost similar to the modern ones made in a native pottery at Singil, some twenty miles away. As the latter are made for ritual washings, it is probable that the Samaria examples were used for the same purpose. Among other finds are animal and human figurines, inscribed weights, and several circular cosmetic saucers of stone like those found at Gezer and elsewhere. The excavations at this northern capital of Israel promise a flood of light on Old Testament history and customs.

The discovery of Solomon's stables at Megiddo and other places has raised the question as to where and how he procured his horses. Judging from the traditions which are known to us from the el-Amarna Tablets, it seems probable that he engaged in the business of horse-dealing on a large and profitable scale. On the one hand, he purchased chariots

Egypt, and exported them to the Hittites or North Syrians and to the people of Damascus and the Euphrates region; while, on the other hand, he bought horses in Cilicia, which, as Herodotus tells us, was famed for its horse-breeding (cf. Ezk 27¹⁴), and he sold these to Egypt, where, owing to the lack of extensive pastures, there could be no export trade of this kind. Is it too much to conclude that it was the needs of such trade, rather than the military organization of the kingdom of Israel, that led to the building of Solomon's commodious stables? These at all events are placed on the high road from Syria to Egypt.

We now have additional information by Professor Albright as to the recent discoveries at *Beit Mirsim* (believed to be Kiriath-sepher or Debir). During the period of the Jewish monarchy, the people adopted an entirely new type of house construction. The ceiling was supported by three or four stone pillars (generally four), five to six feet high, standing on a stylobate. Practically every house possessed one of these pillar alignments; and as each of the monoliths weighed from 1800 to 3100 pounds, and had to be dragged from the quarry uphill into the town, we may well have what Professor Albright calls 'a new respect for the native energy and industry of these Judæan peasants.' The houses, about three hundred in number, were closely crowded together, with only narrow passages and small open areas at the doorways. The whole area within the walls was not more than about eight acres, and the population is estimated as between 2500 and 3000, though there seems to have been a population that overflowed the walled area. No cattle, sheep, or goats were kept in the city, all being confined to their folds outside, and this helped to make sanitary conditions good. There were two gates into the city, an eastern and a western one, the former being less than seven feet wide (just enough, perhaps, for chariots), and the latter only three feet suitable for pedestrians and laden asses). The town, in addition to farming, had a special industry of its own—that of woollen textiles, including spinning, weaving, and dyeing. Evidence shows that nearly every house had a loom. Six massive flax-plants have been discovered, the first to be unearthed in Palestine. They are made of single zones about three feet high, the interior being hollowed out in the form of a spherical basin. They were apparently hewn to last for ages, and were thus vastly superior to the flimsy structures employed by the modern natives. About a dozen cosmetic palettes have been found, which were evidently used to prepare the mineral substances

contained in face-paints, such as powdered *pūk* or *kuhl* (manganese or antimony, cf. Jezebel, 2 K 9³⁰), malachite, and hæmatite clay (red ochre). Professor Albright points out that Isaiah was truly not without justification when he denounced the frivolity of the daughters of Zion (Is 3¹⁸⁻²³). The town seems to have been destroyed by a terrific conflagration in 588 B.C., when the last siege of Jerusalem began.

A most important problem awaiting solution in connexion with Professor Garstang's researches at Jericho is the exact date of its destruction by Joshua. Hitherto scholars have differed by two centuries or more in their reckoning of this event. The evidence now presented lies in a vast amount of material, of unparalleled profusion and variety, found in the royal tombs, and representing the height of Canaanite civilization. The bulk of the scarabs range from Hyksos times about 2400 to 1400 B.C. All this material is being carefully studied. In order to arrive at the truth, the expedition has been concentrating on the clearance of the latest tombs, which lie on the outskirts of the necropolis. So far, the last royal interment disclosed is that of a chieftain in the time of Amenophis III. (c. 1419-1383 B.C.). Deposits of later date are sparse, discontinuous, and intrusive. Professor Newberry, the Cairo expert on scarabs, has not found any scarabs in the collection between the reign of Amenophis III. and the Ramessides—the period from that Pharaoh to Ramesses II. is blank. All this seems to point, as the pottery does, to the earlier date of about 1400 B.C. for the Conquest, which accords with the Biblical chronology. The Exodus from Egypt must therefore have taken place, as the writer has advocated on other external grounds, about 1445 B.C., just after the death of Tuthmosis III., and during the reign of Amenophis II. The chieftain referred to, so far the last known 'king' of Jericho, was a young man, whose name Garstang gives provisionally as *A-kha*. When the Israelites attacked the town, its enclosed area seems to have been reduced to about six acres, so that the population at the time could not have been more than a thousand souls.

Another important question which has been awaiting solution has been that of the collapse of the walls. The theory that the fall was due to rhythmic vibrations set up by the tramping of armed men accompanied by sustained trumpet notes is improbable, as the walls, which have been strongly built with twenty-two inch bricks, must have been too solid to be thus loosened. Similarly, the theory of undermining, which was at one time

regarded as probable, has now been abandoned by Dr. Garstang, as the dark striations below the foundations, though deflected downward by the great pressure of the fallen mass, have been found to be continuous instead of being interrupted, as they would have been if digging had taken place. A study of the geological strata, together with a careful examination of the walls themselves, has now revealed, according to Dr. Garstang, assured evidence that the collapse was caused by an earthquake (cf. Ps 114, 'Jordan was driven back; the mountains skipped like rams,' etc.). Archæologists and Biblical scholars await with interest Dr. Garstang's further details on such important questions. It is clear that the discoveries at Jericho may have some far-reaching effects on Biblical history.

Excavations have been proceeding at ancient Sepphoris (*Seffūriyeh*), where Professor L. Waterman of the University of Michigan has been in charge; at Shiloh (*Seilūn*), where a Danish expedition under Dr. Aage Schmidt has been working; at *Ramat Rachel*, two miles south of Jerusalem, where ancient remains had been discovered during building operations; and at other places. At *Balâtah*, or 'the Tower of Shechem' (a little south of *Nāblus*), referred to in Jg 9^{40ff.}, Dr. G. Welter has been making a study of the site with modern archæological methods, in order to solve the problem of the city walls. He has found the space between the outer and inner walls to be filled with packed earth, forming a slope at the top of which had stood a wall of mud brick, all these dating, he thinks, from about 1500 B.C. On the north and south sides of the town he has discovered great gates, one of them approached by a ramp from the side in such a way as to expose attacking soldiers to the defenders on the wall. On the adjoining slope of Mt. Gerizim, he has uncovered a sanctuary of the late Bronze Age (1600-1200 B.C.), containing a pillar (*massēbā*), which may well have been that of Baal-Berith, the

god of Shechem (cf. Jg. 8³³ 9⁴. 46). No expeditions have been working recently at Jerusalem, but an accidental discovery has been made almost in the centre of the ancient city. In the course of repairs on the sewer, which runs down the Tyropœan Valley, two levels of pavement have been found, one about nine feet below the present level of the street, and the other nearly six feet lower still. Pottery has been unearthed above, between, and below these pavements, but to what period it belongs is not yet clear.

The future of Biblical archæology is very hopeful. Everywhere extraordinary care and great ingenuity are being devoted to recording, mapping, drawing and photographing everything that is found, and there is a friendly spirit of co-operation between the leaders of the various expeditions, of whatever nationality. Discussions are going on in various British and Continental journals as to the site of the Pentapolis (Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Zoan). Père Mallon, Father Power, Garrod, Duncan, and others prefer *Tuleilat el-Ghassûl* and neighbouring sites just to the north of the Dead Sea, while Professor Albright and others give strong reasons for the south-eastern end—for three of the cities at least. At *el-Ghassûl*, Mallon has discovered a wonderful collection of sherds bearing linear characters, often in groups, and of pebbles with elaborate symbolic carvings, but, according to Albright, these all seem to be from the chalcolith of the third millennium B.C., which points to the site having been abandoned at least a thousand years before Abraham. The question as to the route of the Exodus is also being examined afresh. Very few scholars to-day uphold the traditional identification of Mt. Sinai with Gebel Moussa at the extreme south of the peninsula, but they are divided as to the real location. On such debatable questions we can only await further archæological evidence.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Secular Religion.¹

By 'secular religion' Herr Schütz means the temper of those who seek to bring in the Kingdom

¹ *Sæculare Religion: Eine Studie ueber ihre Erscheinung in der Gegenwart und ihre Idee bei Schleiermacher und Blumhardt d. J., by Paul Schütz* (Mohr, Tübingen; M. 11 [Beitraege zur Systematischen Theologie, ii. 1932]).

of God on earth by observation and organization in any shape or form (pp. 15, 190, 203, etc.), the mobilizing of human effort to organize the perfect social order by relying upon insight and culture instead of upon God alone. What is this but an attempt to build the tower of Babel over again or, as he likes to put it, lending an ear to the devil's suggestion that 'ye shall be as gods'? For He

Schütz is fond of appealing to the third chapter of Genesis in his dramatic exposition of religion and civilization. He actually illustrates his point by suggesting that man only becomes God's fellow-worker when he is cast into a deep sleep, that is, when he is in faith, *sola fide*. The modern man, even the modern Christian, is, on the other hand, dreadfully awake; indeed, as the 'religious man,' he is acutely conscious of his own powers and indisposed to own any real need of God at all. This Lutheran or even Barthian position is stated with staccato emphasis, which amounts to an oracular deliverance upon the present state of the world. It is based upon two arguments. One is a subtle metaphysic of Christianity (p. 32 f.), which stresses the revelation of God in the present age; the signs of the times, which are to be read by all men here and now, are God's revelation of eschatology, that is, of His Divine purpose and judgment upon man's effort to make himself the chief end of life. This existential metaphysic is accompanied by a survey of the modern situation (pp. 1-32 f., etc.) drawn in sombre colours from observation of the East as well as from an analysis of Europe. What do we find but the primacy of practical reason, the prevalence of imperialism and mammon worship in various forms, and a widespread disposition to rely upon organization rather than upon spiritual forces? A century ago Carlyle urged that the root of our troubles was that we had forgotten God. Herr Schütz does not know his Carlyle, but he does know his Luther, and his panacea for the disease and fever of the present age is 'protestantism' as the Reformation presented it, namely, a disavowal of self-reliance and a repudiation of what is called 'catholicism' in every shape and form, including conferences and programmes of the social gospel, which really mean the bankruptcy of genuine Christianity. Ever since the Renaissance, it is urged, there has been a repeated attempt to do what God alone can do for man; even the Church has been prone to present a Jesus who has yielded to the temptation of compromising with external methods of bringing in the Kingdom instead of being content to wait upon God. In such movements as Bolshevism and Humanism, in propaganda of social reform, and in the schemes of liberal theology, do we not recognize a common element of departure from the authentic gospel as recovered by the glorious Reformation?

This conviction helps to explain the sub-title of the monograph. What have Schleiermacher and young Blumhardt to do with one another, we may

ask—the great Christian thinker and a Social Democrat who is no more than a name, if even that, to most people outside Germany? Well, a thesis sometimes makes strange bed-fellows, but Herr Schütz finds that the romantic idealist and the demagogue are at one in distorting the Christian gospel. They typify the deformation of Christianity. The younger Blumhardt, who broke away from the Protestant ministry to join the Social Democrats in order to advance, as he thought, the 'Kingdom of God' in Germany, is no better than 'the Aquinas of the nineteenth century' (p. 153), with his Prussian patriotism and his romantic philosophy. Both men came forward as active politicians in the name of God. A plague on both of their houses (p. 104 f.). Humanism and socialism alike blunt the edge of Christianity as they seek to use it for their own ends.

One can make allowance for the occasional tinge of soreness or bitterness in some of Herr Schütz's comments. He ranks the Methodists as propagandists of British imperialism, satirizes the Anglo-American project of 'world-dominion' as a form of nationalist Messianism such as in other forms is sweeping the East, and declares that it was Baptists like Rockefeller and Lloyd George who let loose the War upon poor Germany. But he is candid now and then. 'We Germans,' he confesses, 'have forgotten our task in the world of nations; we have forgotten to defend God against ourselves.' As I have hinted, this is by no means a new diagnosis of the situation in Germany or elsewhere. In all nations of Europe there is a real danger of the Church forgetting its reason for existence and allowing itself to be used for ends of philosophy or politics. The brilliant paradoxes of Herr Schütz often prod the reader to recollect this. As when he thanks God that Luther and Calvin had no system of ethics, that the Reformation did not need to organize missions since it was itself a mission, witnessing to the living truth of God, and that it contradicted the idea of progress and natural development! 'At the Reformation the Western Church for the last time looked back to the original Church and in the mirror of Scripture saw the true Church' (p. 49), whereas in the Counter-Reformation both the Roman Church and the sects represent the Renaissance man who believes in plans of his own and in the Church as a machine or organization for carrying out this or that project. What we have to do, Herr Schütz aptly claims, is to meet the danger of our own day, as the Reformers met the danger of theirs; our enemy is not only without but within the Church,

as synergism, moralism, imperialism, socialism, militarism, and also pacifism, which are rampant in Western and particularly in Anglo-Saxon Christendom; these are our equivalent for 'salvation by works,' the supreme heresy. Here, then, we have a pungent protest against the relativism of the historical method, the evaporation of real Christianity by idealist philosophy, and the prostitution of the Church to Demos and Mammon; but the protest is too one-sided. It is not enough to expose the exaggerations of the sociological method. Many who will be ready to sympathize with the burden of Herr Schütz's drastic analysis will at the same time refuse to read the signs of the times so narrowly as he seems to do. In particular, there will be a disposition to estimate modern missions and Conferences like those of Stockholm and Lausanne more generously than a writer does who cannot see much more in them than an activist effort to pool external resources and rehabilitate faith by recourse to what is irrelevant to faith.

The Meaning of Redemption.¹

PROFESSOR PIPER has acutely noted two points. One is that 'redemption' has a broader range than the mere deliverance from sin and guilt. Sin and suffering indeed form one of its objects, but it covers a wider sphere. He might have illustrated this truth by referring to the real meaning of the cognate term 'salvation' in the New Testament, which denotes the positive endowment of life; but, as it is, he makes his point clearly. Redemption is a central term and idea within Christianity, but, as he urges, it connotes the need of emancipation from whatever limits and enslaves human personality. The second point is that redemption must not be identified with a merely objective fact which takes place outside experience. He justly finds this tendency towards an abstract objectivity in some forms of ultra-Lutheran theology, in the orthodoxy which is inclined to make man believe in redemption rather than experience it through faith. Pietism, he thinks, witnessed to the truth. In fact, 'modern Protestant piety is only the piety of redemption in so far as it is influenced by pietism' (p. 7). But even so, the full sweep and scope of redemption require to be re-

asserted, and this is the main thesis of the monograph. With keen analytic power the author traces the experience of man as a being who becomes conscious of the need for 'redemption' as he realizes his limitations. He is a creature, with aims which he seems unable of himself to realize, hemmed in by fate and fortune. He is mortal, tempted to isolate himself from others; he is sinful, taking life into his own hands in the effort to realize himself, instead of realizing that he belongs to Another (At this point the English reader is reminded of Dr. Scott Holland's argument for faith in the essay he contributed to *Lux Mundi*). According to Dr. Piper, man becomes conscious of all this before he realizes what sin is (pp. 26 f.); it is forced upon him by his sense of the universe, and redemption is the deliverance from such an *impasse* through faith in the God who has a purpose in the world. The supreme revelation of this purpose comes through Jesus Christ, in whom man sees a 'telos' or object in the world, which relieves him from the chaos. To believe in this revelation by an act of faith is to enjoy an experience which redeems man from the fear of unreality or futility in the world of reality. Faith (pp. 35 f.) is therefore interpreted as more than belief. We pray, 'Thy Will be done,' not 'Thy Will be known'; i.e. the attitude is of readiness to be enabled by God to do and bear His will, to further His ends, and so to be emancipated from the slavery of the world. New possibilities of life are thus set free; faith becomes creative and active, as we identify ourselves with God's 'telos' in His world. This, it is argued, throws light upon the consciousness of being His 'children.' Dr. Piper concludes his succinct monograph by reaffirming the two sides of this redemptive faith; it is not self-redemption, for it rests upon the Divine revelation in Jesus Christ, but on the other hand, it does not reduce men to being mere marionettes in the universe, for their faith is the new vitality of a life which sides with the living and real God.

The problem with which Professor Piper is concerned is of more than theological importance; he criticises some contemporary theologians, but his real interest rightly lies in putting a true content into the term 'redemption.' It is all to the good that he postulates this idea as distinctive of real Christianity. No statement of Christianity, however socially inspiring, is adequate if it leaves out this belief. As Dr. Bosanquet once remarked, morality has its demands and its social atmosphere which make it a half-way house to religion, but there is no religion, certainly no Christian religion,

¹ *Erlösung als Erfahrung*, von D. Otto Piper. Sammlung Gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte; 157 (Mohr, Tübingen. M. 1.50).

which does not reiterate the need of faith. What the ground and object of redemptive faith, in its fullest scope, must be understood to be, is the theme of this stimulating treatise.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

Theology and Ethics.

THE second volume is published of a series dealing comprehensively and systematically with the manifold problems arising out of the relations between theology and ethics. The general title is 'Studies in the Formation and Development of Character and the Religious Life.' The editor of the series is Dr. Johannes Neumann of Giessen. Vol. i., *Introduction to Psycho-therapy* (M.14), is a handbook for ministers designed to assist them in their pastoral work. It has been well received and has been followed by Vol. ii., *The Evolution of the Moral Personality*.¹

Twenty essays by as many writers are divided into four parts. In Part i. the subject is treated by experts chosen for their knowledge respectively of Chinese philosophy, the Ethics of Buddhism, Judaism, Early Christianity, Catholicism, Oriental Christianity (Dr. Karl Beth), Russian Christianity (Dr. Nikolaus v. Arseniew), Calvinism, Lutheranism, and Mysticism. Part ii., by Privatdozent Dr. med. R. Allers, Vienna, investigates the biological factors involved and defines the limits of their application. Part iii. is devoted to the teaching of five different schools of psychology, and Part iv. to the tenets of four different systems of ethics. Even to summarize a work so elaborate is impossible within the limits of a short notice, but it may be said that a careful, though not exhaustive reading of the essays reveals a high average of excellence.

Dr. A. Köberle of Basle writes on 'Lutheranism.' He expands the editor's explanation of the sense in which Evolution is used throughout the work: 'In the strict sense of the word, Evolution is as strange to the Church of the Reformation as it is to the New Testament.' The evangelical view of Evolution is defined as 'the formation of Christian character by progress in, and maturing of the new life of fellowship with God, advancing from the frailty and weakness of the childhood of faith to the perfection of Christian manhood.'

¹ *Die Entwicklung zur sittlichen Persönlichkeit* Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; pp. viii, 455; geh. Mk.15, geb. Mk.17).

In his preface the editor accounts for the absence of representatives of the Barthian theology from the list of contributors by saying that 'they excluded themselves.' But Dr. Köberle expresses appreciation of 'the powerful stimulus' this school of thought has given to Reformation principles. He regrets that 'the theology of crisis' confines its opposition to such foes as 'law, the righteousness of works and moral idealism' instead of confronting 'the real enemy of our time—secularism.' Hopeful signs are, however, discerned in the writings of Brunner.

In a lecture on 'The Theological Basis of Ethics,'² Dr. Fr. W. Schmidt contrasts the present situation with the days of Albrecht Ritschl's ascendancy, when Ethics, especially the re-discovered Kantian *Critique* became 'the backbone and support' of Theology threatened by Materialism. To-day, Theology cannot lean upon a generally accepted morality, for Nietzsche's prophecy is fulfilled: 'Faith in morality, in all morality is wavering.' In the course of a closely reasoned argument whose purpose is to show that a theological ethic is not a *contradictio in adiecto*, Professor Schmidt dwells on *gratia praeveniens*, for God is not at the end, but at the beginning of our way; this fact 'constitutes an evangelical ethic, i.e. an ethic deriving its imperative rule from the indicative of the gospel. . . . The basal *promissio*: "I am the Lord, thy God," cannot be truly believed unless the involved imperative is obeyed: "Thou shalt have none other Gods but me." Luther's saying: *Deus vult hominem per hominem salvare* is shown to imply that 'we can have God only when we have our neighbour.' Prominence is given in the latter part of the lecture to the implications of the Pauline phrase, *ἐν χριστῷ*: 'We are truly selves only because, and in so far as we are not ourselves, but Christ is in us.' This able lecture compresses into a few pages a valuable contribution towards the solution of a problem of vital importance.

Professor Dr. J. Hänel of Münster-i.-W. has written on *Old Testament Ethics*, and his book has been described as 'the best apologetic against anti-semitic destructive criticism.' His latest work,³

² *Die theologische Begründung der Ethik*, von Dr. Fr. W. Schmidt, ord. Professor der Theologie in Münster-i.-W. (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; pp. 45; Mk.1.50).

³ *Die Religion der Heiligkeit*, von Prof. Dr. J. Hänel, Münster-i.-W. (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; pp. viii, 331; geb. Mk.13).

The Religion of Holiness, might have been entitled 'Old Testament Religion,' for it contains only one short chapter on 'The Holiness of God in the New Testament,' and its main thesis is that the holiness of God is the essential element in the religion of the Old Testament. The distinguishing feature of Professor Hänel's treatment of his theme is his differentiation between five types of holiness and his relegation to a subordinate position of chronological considerations. It is not claimed that the epochs into which historical criticism divides the religion of Israel are quite coincident with the forms in which holiness was conceived. 'The several types . . . are not uniformly distributed amongst the various strata of the O.T.'; nevertheless they impart to the different periods their distinguishing characteristics.

Holiness regarded as 'unapproachableness' (*Unnahbarkeit*) belongs to the pre-Mosaic period or even to earlier times; in the patriarchal age 'sublimity' (*Hoheit*) is the chief characteristic of holiness; throughout the epoch extending from Moses to the writing prophets 'zeal' (*Eifer*) is the leading feature; as 'perfection' (*Vollkommenheit*) holiness was conceived in the ideal world of the pre-exilic prophets; as *Jenseitsvollkommenheit* the holiness of the post-exilic age is described, Ezra and Nehemiah being its chief representatives, though in Ezekiel's writings there are evidences of it. 'The dominating conception of God was that His throne is in heaven'; stress was laid upon His transcendence. That this scheme needs modification here and there is granted. It has been presented briefly in outline to give a fair though necessarily incomplete idea of Professor Hänel's work. Many will find difficulty in reconciling his views of inspiration with the results of their critical studies.

J. G. TASKER.

Leamington Spa.

can find its full justification in the teaching of the Apostle, and to win youth in the Churches for it. 'In these years,' he says, 'in which the longing for the unity of Christendom more than ever is laying hold on the young people around us, and in world meetings is attracting them to immediate joint responsibility for it, it is a very serious desire of the following pages, to guide Christian œcumenical thought to its alone healthy rooting in the Scriptures' (p. 8). With characteristic thoroughness the subject is dealt with in two ways. First the Epistles are examined to show the œcumenical message of each in its own context; and then the proclamation by Paul of the unity of the Church is systematically presented. The second is developed in five stages forming a climax of argument. First of all the author shows how the tendrils of the unity of Christendom can be traced in the living relations of Christians to one another in common joy, sorrow, service. Secondly, the active love of Christians draws them close to one another. Thirdly, this unity finds expression in common intercession, and intercession world-wide in its scope. Fourthly, the foundation of that unity is in the reality that all divisions are transcended in the unity of all believers in Christ. Lastly, that unity is shown in its completeness in the great mystery of the oneness of the body of Christ. Each of these many themes has six sub-divisions, and to each section is added a short questionnaire to guide meditation. The relevant passages are quoted in full, and explained in brief notes. Such a careful study is well fitted to deepen the conviction that the œcumenical movements are of God; and that the Churches will best be sustained, guided and guarded in them as they return to the New Testament, and recover its thought and life in the Spirit of God.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

The Unity of the Christian Church.

THIS small book,¹ designed as a guide for study groups, affords further evidence of the hold which the Christian Reunion Movement has on the Churches of Germany. The author writes on the subject *con amore*, as he holds an influential position in both the Stockholm and the Lausanne Movements. It is described in the title as a Bible Study of the Letters of Paul to Churches; and it is intended to show that this modern movement

¹ *Die Einheit der Christenheit*, von D. Erich Stange (Furche-Verlag, Berlin; R.M.2).

Varia.

It has been for some time recognized that the narrative chapters, at any rate, in the Book of Daniel are not a creation of the Maccabean period but rest upon pre-Maccabean literary material. Professor Junker, of Passau, goes further, and ably argues² that this is also true of the latter half of the book. One difficulty in accepting any other than a Maccabean date for the book as a whole has been

² *Untersuchungen über literarische und exegetische Probleme des Buches Daniel*, von Dr. Hubert Junker (Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, Bonn; Mk.6).

that the detail in ch. 11, though given in the form of a vision, transparently belongs to the Maccabean period. Another difficulty, equally formidable, has been that the fourth kingdom in the visions of chs. 2 and 7 seems to point unmistakably to the Greek empire and, at any rate, in ch. 7, to Antiochus. Junker meets the second difficulty by suggesting that it is a mistake to regard the four kingdoms as historical; they are symbolical, as the number 4 often is, and not to be sought in the sphere of historical experience. They are apocalyptic in spirit, they represent the powers hostile to the Kingdom of God, and are comparable to the four horns in Zec 2^{1ff.} (A.V. 1^{18ff.}). In that case, there would be no need to bring the book down to the Greek period, it might equally well belong to the Persian period, and the kernel of it might be as old as Zechariah's 'horns,' i.e. about 520 B.C. The other difficulty Junker meets by admitting that the writer of the book as we now have it, living as he did in the Maccabean period, extended the original prophecies by a somewhat detailed application to his own time. In this he was but acting in the spirit of those prophecies and in no way violating the 'revelatory' character of the book. Thus the book, narrative and vision alike, constitutes a real unity, which, while coming in its present form from the Maccabean period, rests throughout upon older material.

To the Roman Catholic series of 'Commentaries on the Old Testament,' Paul Szczygiel, M.S.C., contributes the Commentary on Job.¹ The writer, who shows a thorough acquaintance with the Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic literature, deals in the Introduction with the purpose, problem, unity, authorship, and canonicity of the book. In common with most Catholic scholars he defends the authenticity of the speeches of Elihu, without which, he argues, the book would be a torso: they emphasize the disciplinary and purifying power of suffering, of which the earlier speeches had taken no account, and they prepare the way for the speeches of Jehovah, whose opening allusion to the 'counsel' which Job's words have darkened is taken to refer not to Jehovah's wonderful 'world-plan,' but to the truth emphasized by Elihu. The writer also defends the authenticity of ch. 28, but places it after 42⁶, where it is immensely more appropriate. The descriptions of the hippopotamus and the crocodile (40^{15-41²⁶}) are also regarded as

authentic and even necessary, designed as they are to convince Job of his own impotence. (But surely ch. 9 shows that Job is already only too conscious of this.) Szczygiel assigns the date to the years before the Babylonian exile, to which he thinks 12¹⁷⁻¹⁹ do not refer: the book is an anticipatory consolation for the sorrows in store.

As illustrative of his exegetical methods and results, we may take the famous passage in 19^{25ff.}. He finds no reference in these verses to the future life. Job shows the same perplexity after this utterance as before, and the gloomy description of the future that follows in 21²³⁻²⁶ is evidence that he anticipates nothing from it. The verses in ch. 19 only express his conviction that he will yet be healed: the seeing of God's face means no more than that he will enjoy His favour, which will be expressed in this way. 'In (lit. from) my flesh' is taken to mean 'during my earthly life.' The writer makes two interesting contributions to the textual criticism of the passage. In אָחֵר in v.²⁸ he reads as אָחֵר, and נִקְפָּה וְנִקְפָּה (a Pi., only here, for the customary Hiph., and in the sense of 'surround'): the meaning then will be, 'and my flesh shall become new, and (again) engirdle this (body).' The אָחֵר of v.^{27a} seems to S. improbable after the אָחֵר in v.^{26b}: he accordingly points אָחֵר, and translates, 'Him, to whom I cling, mine eyes shall see.'

The exact relation of Philo's Judæo-Hellenistic Agada to the Palestinian Midrash is difficult to determine. Sometimes they agree practically word for word, as in the curious comment on Enoch, which in Philo runs thus: τοῦ βίου τὸν μὲν πρότερον χρόνον ἀναθεὶς κακίᾳ, τὸν δ' ὕστερον ἀρετῇ, and in the Midrash thus: הַנּוֹר חָנַף הָיָה פְּעָמִים הָיָה צָדִיק וּפְעָמִים רָשָׁע. Sometimes they go their separate ways, as in their comment on Bezalel, which starts in both cases from the literal meaning, 'in the shadow of God' (ἐν σκιά τοῦ θεοῦ, בצל אֵל). The Midrash regards him as living in the shadow, i.e. in the neighbourhood, of God, and therefore better equipped with knowledge, in certain directions, than Moses: it is he who designs the Tent of Meeting and its furniture. Philo regards the 'shadow' as something unsubstantial: Moses is therefore superior to Bezalel, as he made his way to God Himself, whereas Bezalel was only in His shadow. The Agada, though fond of fabulous embellishments, remains more or less closely associated with history, but it readily passes into allegory. On the simple statement, 'Joseph is yet alive' (Gn 45²⁸), both Philo

¹ Das Buch Job übersetzt und erklärt (Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung, Bonn; geh. Mk.9.20, geb. Mk.11.20).

and the Midrash put a spiritual interpretation. Jacob marvels, says Philo, that in such an environment Joseph has escaped spiritual death, while the Midrash explains that he did not succumb to life's temptations. The whole problem of their relationship is carefully discussed by Dr. Edmund Stein¹ on the basis of numerous illustrations drawn from their respective treatment of the figures in the Pentateuch—not only the greater figures, like Adam, Abraham, Noah, and Moses, but the lesser figures such as Nimrod, Eber, and Terah.

The last number of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*² is rich in interest and variety. Pedersen discusses the progress of Old Testament interpretation during last century, which was dominated too much, he argues, by Hegelian philosophy, the evolutionary theory, and literary criticism, and he suggests that it should now advance along the lines laid down by Herder. The dates of documents, even if they could be established, are of little use for the history of the culture of a people: the life of the soul may remain much the same through many epochs, and dates do not greatly matter. JE, D, and P are parallel rather than successive, and they have all received their present form in the post-exilic period. Budde deals exhaustively with the text and substance of Is 2-4. In spite of the tempting ἀπαλοῦντες of the LXX in 3¹² he refuses to point נִשִּׁים as נְשִׁים, retaining the 'women' of tradition. Is 2²⁻⁴ he assigns to a period later than Deutero-Isaiah. In a discussion of 'Typographic Arrangement of Ancient Hebrew Poetry,' Slotki makes it highly probable that, in the interests of economy of space, 'many poems

¹ *Philo und der Midrasch* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.3.20).

² 1931, Heft 3-4 (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.10).

which contained repetitions were originally recorded in such a manner as to avoid the writing of the same term or terms more than once,' and he supports his contention by the analogy of Babylonian documents. Rudolph devotes his attention to Obadiah, and concludes that vv.¹⁻¹⁴, 15^b were written soon after 586, and vv.^{15a}, 16-18 probably about the same time, while vv.¹⁹⁻²¹ are an appendix difficult to date. Marmorstein discusses the newly discovered fragments of the Jerusalem Targum, which he regards as 'of the very greatest importance.' Richter deals with the genealogical lists in 1 Ch 2-9, Jensen with the Paradise topography in Gn 2¹⁰⁻¹⁴, Marmelstein with traces of ancient Oriental influence in Rabbinic literature ('A Horus-Osiris motif in the Agada'), and there are many valuable 'communications' on minor points. Next in point of general interest to Pedersen's essay is a striking paper by Mowinckel in continuation of his Deutero-Isaiah studies. The paper is much too full even to summarize briefly, but here are some of the points. The whole of Is 40-55 was written in Judah after the fall of Babylon: the Servant of Yahweh songs were written later, also probably in Judah, but not by Deutero-Isaiah, and interpolated in the finished book. Mowinckel has abandoned his earlier view that the Servant is the poet himself. Now he recognizes that that is unnatural, as his death is presupposed in Is 53; but he suggests that the supposition may have this much of truth in it, that Deutero-Isaiah was indeed martyred and that the Songs were written by a member of the disciple circle, which may have celebrated him as a 'cult-hero' and portrayed him with mythological colours. This essay is a very important contribution to the Deutero-Isaiah problem.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Trinity College, Glasgow.

Contributions and Comments.

'The Kingdom of God is within you.'

WILL you admit a few remarks of comment on a sermon that appeared in your issue of January, on the passage 'The Kingdom of God is within you' (Lk 17²¹)? As to the presentation of the ideas in the sermon, it would be presumptuous of me to

offer criticism, and there are points in it which I appreciate; but I am bold to say that the text cannot possibly bear the exegesis that the writer has drawn from it. The marginal readings for ἐντός ὑμῶν, 'in the midst of you,' 'among you,' which he disparages, are almost certainly the more correct translations; for the word ἐντός may mean this as rightly as 'within'; and the deciding

point is that (on which Dean Alford insists), as the sentence was spoken to the Pharisees in whose hearts the Kingdom *was not*, for their questioning had been put with no good end in view, so the words could not bear the spiritual meaning for them, even potentially. While they were in that frame of mind, the Kingdom was very far from being 'within them,' but it was all around them, as long as the Lord Himself was near.

—ALBERT GEO. SMITH.

Lochgelly, Fifeshire.

The First Person Plural as used by St. Paul.

WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D., in his article on 'The development of Paul's Doctrine of Dying and rising again with Christ,' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September 1931 (p. 563), says: 'There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that Moffatt has given the true meaning of the first person plural by rendering throughout with the first person singular.' This position was asserted twenty or eighty years ago in *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, by Conybeare and Howson, whose admirable translation of St. Paul's Epistles is, I am afraid, less known than it ought to be.

—ROBERT A. MOODY.

Glasgow.

Pentecost, the Day of Power.

ACCORDING to Lk 24⁴⁹, the disciples were bidden to remain in Jerusalem until they received 'power from on high.' That the Evangelist meant by this the gift of the Holy Spirit is clear from Ac 1⁸, 'But ye shall receive power from on high, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you.' This gift of the Holy Spirit came to them 'when the day of Pentecost was fully come' (Ac 2¹). The details of their experience are given in the next three verses. Two questions arise. First, was there any reason why this particular experience should come to pass on the day of Pentecost rather than on any other day? Second, Is there any reason why this experience should be described with the particular details which Luke has given?

(1) There is a definite reason why the experience could have taken place on the Feast of Pentecost. There is a definite connexion between Pentecost and 'power from on high.' This is shown by the synagogal readings for the day. According to the Mishnah, the lessons were Dt 16⁹ or Ex 19, and from the Prophets, Hab 3 or Ezk 1, and the state-

ment is made that since now the festival lasts for two days, all four lessons are used. All these four lessons are certainly, therefore, as old as A.D. 100, and some of them, at any rate, may be considerably earlier. In the Book of Jubilees 6¹⁷⁻²² we find a statement thrice repeated that Pentecost is confined to one day in the year. This emphasis raises 'a suspicion that the author is combating an innovation of adding a second' day.¹ The earlier lesson from the Law was doubtless Dt 16⁹, though that itself probably displaced the relevant verses from Lv 23, from whence probably, as Büchler has shown,² the first Festival Lessons were drawn. That Ex 19 is a lesson adopted later is probable from the fact that it chances to be the ordinary reading which falls to Pentecost in the regular reading of the Law following the system by which the Law was read from beginning to end over a period of three years. This 'accident' is the ground for the association of the Giving of the Law and the Feast of Pentecost. Whilst this connexion is not found in the Old Testament, in Philo, or in Josephus, we have nevertheless evidence that the system of regular Sabbath readings from the Law was firmly established at the beginning of the Christian Era, and that there were readings from the Prophets, whether fixed or left to the choice of the reader, in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk 4^{16ff.}) and also at Antioch in Pisidia.³ Paul can claim the regular reading from the Law in the synagogues as a long-established custom, apparently among the Diaspora as well as in Jerusalem (Ac 15²¹). Whilst there must be a certain amount of uncertainty in the present state of the evidence, it is probable that Ex 19 was established as a Pentecostal reading before the time of Christ, and that both Hab 3 and Ezk 1 were established as the regular Haphtaroth, or Prophetical Readings. This is confirmed by the prohibition in Meg 4¹⁰ against the reading of Ezk 1 as a Haphtarah at all. Evidently it must have been read as such in pre-Mishnaic times. The Pentecostal Psalms were 29 and 68, the first on the authority of the tractate Sopherim, and the second according to Rabbinic tradition. As St. John Thackeray pointed out, the common theme of all four selections from the Prophets and the Psalms

¹ H. St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures, 1920), 46 ff., where the Pentecostal Readings and Psalms are discussed at length.

² *J.Q.R.* v. 420.

³ Ac 13¹⁶, where the reference suggests that the readings from the Law and from the Prophets were both equally fixed as an integral part of the service.

'is a theophany in a thunderstorm, a triumphal march or ride of the deity across the desert, sea, or heavens, amid a general convulsion of nature.' There is involved in this a display of the tremendous, overwhelming Power of Jehovah, and this feature is evident also in the Reading from the Law (Ex 19). Pentecost is the Day of Power.

(2) The description of the phenomena of the giving of the Holy Spirit in Ac 2²⁻⁴ is dependent, though not in phraseology, on these Pentecostal lessons and psalms.

Compare Ac 2², 'And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of a rushing mighty wind,' and Ezk 1⁴, 'And, behold, a stormy wind came out of the north.' In the prayer of Habakkuk, in Pss 29 and 68, there is the same onward, tempestuous rush of Jehovah, with the accompaniment of thunder, lightning, earthquake, and fire. Again, Ac 2³: 'And there appeared divided (διαμεριζόμεναι) tongues as of fire' is connected with Ps 29⁷: 'The voice of Jehovah cleaveth (LXX διακόπτοντος) the flames of fire.' For the 'tongues,' there are the ninefold voice of Jehovah in Ps 29, voice of the Almighty in Ezk 1^{24, 25} with the 'tumult of many waters,' and the voices of Sinai. It has long been realized that there is a connexion between the many languages of Ac 2⁵⁻¹¹, and the Rabbinic tradition that the voices at Sinai were seventy-two in number, each voice being in one of the seventy-two languages which comprised all the tongues of earth. We point out that the connexion here, as in the other details of the description in Ac 2, is through the proper lessons and Psalms for the day. There is in Ac 2²⁻⁴ one chief detail missing, namely, the earthquake. This, however, appears in the description of another descent of the Holy Ghost after the release of Peter and John (Ac 4³¹): 'The place was shaken where they were gathered together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.' The association of a general upheaval of Nature may also be found in the quotation which Peter gives from Joel 2²⁸⁻³², which, though not a Pentecostal passage, contains a description not simply of the results attending the gift of the Spirit of Jehovah, but also of the terrible upheaval of Nature which accompanies it, just as in the Haph-tarah from Habakkuk and in the Psalms.

The situation during the days which followed the Crucifixion would, on the basis of the theory outlined above, be that the disciples were waiting expectantly in Jerusalem for the 'power' to come from on high. The little company 'all with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer' (Ac 1¹⁴). They were praying for 'power from on high,'

according to the promise. Pentecost was the day of Power. Psychologically the Power was bound to come to their expectant hearts on that day and, further, their experience of It was bound to be conditioned by their thoughts of the associations of the day of Pentecost in their previous worship together. The associations of the Festival, their thoughts, and their prayers laid the foundations for a demonstration to them on the day of Power of the irresistible might of God as revealed in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Again, Pentecost does not mean a descent of the Holy Ghost like a dove, gentle, peaceful, mild. Rather it signifies Power, greater than that which changes the face of the desert, cleaves the mountains in twain, greater than that which causes terrors in the heaven above and on the earth beneath. It stands for that onward-rushing, irresistible, compelling Power which drives men forward in a strength not of themselves.

NORMAN H. SNAITH.

Felling-on-Tyne.

Herod Antipas and 'that Fox.'

THERE are indications in the Gospels that more than once our Lord undertook a journey in order to place Himself beyond the dominion of Herod Antipas. At the same time it should be remembered that He had another enemy at least as formidable in the Jewish religious authorities. Indeed, it seems possible that Professor F. C. Burkitt, in his invaluable *Gospel History*, has somewhat overstated the pressure from the Herodian side. That Jesus was in peril from that quarter cannot be denied, but the peril was intermittent and relatively decreasing.

Our Lord was faced, in fact, with danger from two sources differing both in their character and intensity. Beyond doubt, His serious enemy in the Jewish professional religious interest. These men, who should have furnished His natural supporters, were roused at an early stage to critical resentment of His attitude, until they came to hate Him unto death with an unnatural bitterness.

It is quite otherwise with Antipas. He destroys the Baptist, and no doubt regards Jesus as an enemy of the same kind. He dreads the honest rebuke of a good man, but having the power he can solace himself with revenge. Yet he does not seem to pursue Jesus with malicious attention. Perhaps they regard each other as potential enemies and stand warily, knowing which can invoke the 'secular arm.' Even with the Baptist he toyed

or months, wavering between exasperation and superstition, and the end is precipitated before he is ready to make a decision. Perhaps the strongest proof of his feeble inconstancy comes from St. Luke's account of the opportunity which Pilate gave him of examining Jesus before the Roman trial. We certainly do not gain the impression there that Herod was an implacable enemy. If he had ever feared that Jesus might renew the Baptist's censure of his domestic life, he regards Him now merely as a miracle-monger, and he vents upon the Prisoner neither fear nor hate but only chagrin. In short, we may find Herod actively dangerous to Jesus when he has reason to dread interference with his personal sins; or when he is stirred by his partisans under pressure from the Pharisees—their natural opponents but temporary allies. But there is no evidence, nor is it likely, that that pressure was consistently exerted. While, therefore, it is probable that Jesus had to walk circumspectly whenever He was in Herodian country, He was not harassed by Antipas, and His chief anxiety was directed to the religious rather than the civil quarter.

This conclusion has a bearing upon our Lord's movements as He journeyed towards Jerusalem for the last time. If we follow Dr. Burkitt in accepting the 'Western' reading of Mk 10¹, we find Jesus and His company in Judæa—'beyond Jordan' from the standpoint of those disciples who had taken the eastern road. But as Judæa was the stronghold of the priests, and southern Peræa was ruled by Herod, our Lord's mind must have been greatly exercised upon the problem of retaining His liberty of action. In such an ambiguous plight He may well have chosen to linger near the ford where the Peræan road enters Judæa.

This situation presents evident advantages. There was little chance of active and consistent alliance between the priests and Herod. Standing, so to speak, astride the Jordan, which He could cross at will, Jesus secured a valuable respite. How long it served Him we cannot say. It is perhaps reflected in Jn 10⁴⁰. He could afford to delay a little before taking the road through Jericho. People crowded to listen to Him.

Hereabouts, then, but on the Peræan side, we find Him in Lk 13³¹. The malice of the priests has driven Him out, but for the moment He is safe and they are nonplussed. An embassy arrives, smooth-tongued, plausible, beseeching Him 'in His own interest' to return to Judæa. Jesus does not hesitate; it is so evidently the 'spider and the fly.' But who is the 'spider' or, rather,

who 'that fox'? The epithet does not fit Herod. The man whom it does fit is Caiaphas, or maybe Annas. These astute ecclesiastics had made double-dealing diplomacy a fine art. Jesus perceives that the real menace is not from Herod, as the emissaries say, but from the priestly party which has commissioned them. To Caiaphas, therefore, they may take His answer. For the present He will stay and continue His work until His time of 'fulfilment' arrives. He turns to address, perhaps, His own followers rather than the messengers. 'Yet,' He adds, 'to-day and to-morrow and the next day must bring Me on My way, because it is unthinkable for a prophet to die outside of Jerusalem.' The point about 'perishing in Jerusalem' is greatly diminished if the Pharisees bring only a well-meant warning to escape from Peræa. If, however, they bring virtually a summons to Jerusalem and death, the Lord's reply is that He will move in His own time, while nevertheless He recognizes that it is to Jerusalem He must inevitably go. He will neither be hindered nor will He hold back.

L. H. BUNN.

Doncaster.

Was Jesus Compelled?

UNDER this heading a March correspondent recalls an article of the same title in the August number. This previous article appears to suggest the view that Jesus did act under some sort of compulsion, and a case is made out for that point of view in the narrative of St. Luke. The discussion in the March number represents the case from the more usual point of view.

A slightly different view of the matter appeals to the present writer. Compulsion is a strong word. He who 'endured the cross, despising the shame' was scarcely likely to do much under the strict heading of compulsion. May it not be, however, that in spite of the rather circumstantial account of engaging the ass, it was a mere coincidence that Christ entered Jerusalem riding? The previous correspondent writes: 'Would it not be possible that Jesus was tired . . . and that His need of the colt was purely physical, on account of the tedious ascent from Jericho?' There certainly need not have been any extraordinary significance in the entry of a pilgrim into Jerusalem riding upon the usual beast of burden. St. Luke's word (ἐπιβιβάζω) may suggest only the innocent compulsion of friends who observed the physical need of Christ at that stage of the journey. But we may be sure

that the First Gospel, at any rate, would make the fact chime with prophetic detail.

The Fourth Gospel suggests that the incident may have been, at the time, just so natural. Jn 12¹² suggests that a considerable company of Christ's supporters having heard 'that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, took the branches of the palm trees, and went forth to meet him.' At v. 16 it would seem that the detail of His entering upon the ass did not become significant till later. 'These things understood not his disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him.'

St. Mark's Gospel also suggests, only less distinctly, that the incident may have been, at the time, a much more casual matter than is commonly supposed. In this account the occasion is closed with this amazing sentence: 'And he entered into Jerusalem, into the temple; and when he had looked round about upon all things, it being now eventide, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve' (11¹¹). This is a very unsuspecting and sober conclusion to the incident, and it would suggest that it had been a merely local and momentary demonstration which had soon subsided. It may well have been soon suppressed by Christ Himself.

If St. Luke's account has the flavour of compulsion in the matter of Christ's use of the animal, it has also another suggestion that the incident was distasteful to Him. It is this Gospel which reports the protest of the Pharisees at the unseemliness of the display: 'Teacher, rebuke thy disciples!' The Master was probably more inclined to do so than these pedants imagined. But not for the same reasons! He had not the stilted notions of propriety which characterized His critics, but the display was out of keeping with His ideal, nevertheless. Christ's retort that 'if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out' is just one of those enigmatical sayings which may not be easily construed. It implies a rebuke to both parties, the critics and the applauding crowd. As to the former, it amounts to the retort that if people did not sometimes 'let go,' the very universe would have to be vocal. As to the latter, Christ suggests that one might as well expect the stones to speak as these people to preserve a discreet silence. He would have them hold their peace, none the less, for their ideal of His mission was so tragically different from His.

It is possible, therefore, that Jesus was persuaded to enter Jerusalem riding on the ass without any

anticipation that His action would be interpreted in this way. A company of His would-be supporters, seized upon this adventitious parallel, or turned a local demonstration into that vein, or later reported the incident after this manner. The exponents of the politico-religious Messiahship would be sure to do so. Christ Himself may have been sorrowfully indignant, and the acclamation may have subsided as quickly as Mark would seem to suggest, only to be recalled again when a sharp reproof of our Lord had been misunderstood or forgotten. In this sense Christ's supporters 'compelled' an interpretation to be put upon His quiet entry, which He did not anticipate and only with difficulty endured. It is quite possible that from Christ's reply to the protesting Pharisees there has escaped the nuance which reflected upon these misguided zealots who developed the play-acting and furnished the applause. It certainly seems likely that His original words implied it was as impossible to suppress this ill-timed and ill-conceived demonstration as to make the stones to shout.

R. SCOTT FRAYN.

London.

THERE is another way of looking at this matter. If we accept the narrative of the riding into Jerusalem as it stands (Wellhausen, Dalman, Cheyne, and others regard the Messianic colouring as a later addition), the fact that the Roman government took no notice of it shows that it could only have been a formal and spectacular demonstration with parabolic meaning. There was a Roman cohort of several hundred in Herod's palace, and if the entry of Jesus had been of a political character, one cannot understand why the authorities waited several days before intervening. Their inaction would give a revolutionary movement abundant time to grow to a dangerous and uncontrollable state. It has been said that the Romans had to make their attack forceful, and that this could not be done by precipitation. But in the Acts of the Apostles (21-23) we find the Roman officer, at the time of Pentecost, ready for instant action, and we may conclude that Pilate would be equally prepared at the Passover. Dr. Robert Eisler makes the entry equivalent to the proclamation of the Duc de Guise as king of France on the Place de la Concorde, but such an event as the latter did not take place without an armed multitude and much bloodshed, whereas there is absolutely no evidence that the followers of Jesus were armed. The processionists do not seem to have carried swords or staves, but branches of palm-trees,

while Jesus Himself did not ride the war-steed of a king but the colt of an ass, the symbol of peace. Another important fact is that no reference was made to the procession in the trial of Jesus: if it had, it could hardly have escaped mention in the records as we have them. The whole incident was well adapted to remove every idea of earthly power

and glory, even amid the hosannas of the people, and to set forth the spiritual nature of Jesus' kingdom. When the populace asked, 'Who is this?' the reply was not 'Our King,' but 'This is the prophet Jesus' (Mt 21¹⁰).

J. W. JACK.

Glenfarg.

Entre Nous.

The Hound of Heaven.

It will be remembered that, in 'God in the Slums,' Mr. Hugh Redwood wrote: 'All sorts of memories were awake within him now, memories of many years ago which would have amazed his colleagues; but they are part of another story.' This other story has now been written in *God in the Shadows* (Hodder & Stoughton). It falls into two parts, the second continuing the story of 'Big Brother' and Salvation Army work among the poor. But it is the first half that is 'the other story.' In it this influential Fleet Street Editor tells with absolute candour of the backsliding of Peter Rawlings, and of the ways in which the Lord sought and found him. And the rightful name of Peter Rawlings is Hugh Redwood. 'Peter Rawlings' is used to avoid the embarrassment of first person narrative. It is a vivid story and arresting in its sincerity.

Peter Rawlings was the son of a journalist, and on leaving school he went himself into the office of the Liberal daily where his father was chief reporter. School and journalism prepared him for detachment from religion. In his last years at school for a consideration of four shillings a quarter, plus certain special emoluments, but minus miscellaneous ones, he lent a pleasant voice to one of Bristol's countless churches, saw religion from behind the scenes, and quickly formed a very low opinion of it. He was a 'purveyor' of religion, separated by the hancel screen from those who partook. As a journalist he spent the first years reporting inquests which deadened his conscience and sympathy, and a police court reporting he made contact with some of the ugliest things of life. Each year saw him farther on the road to unbelief. 'And yet there were strange workings within him.' 'The God whose presence he never sensed in church would call to him at times in open country,

and then the heart of the lad would throb in answer.'

On a Sunday in 1901—he was eighteen then—he was sent to Broadmead Baptist Church in Bristol to report the sermon of Mrs. Bramwell Booth. 'He saw a woman of something under forty, graceful in carriage, and restrained in gesture. . . . Nor was there any hint of the evangelist when she began to speak. There is not one sentence of her sermon that Peter to-day remembers. If there was a text at all, he has forgotten it. But the voice he recalls, cultured and firm, yet gentle in its inflexions, and the sway of the unremembered words is with him still. . . . The God of whom he had heard the most had been, at the best, remote; accessible only through constant and toilsome prayer; real, perhaps, to the vision of saints and mystics, but vanishing surely as ghost at cockcrow when brought into contact with the commonplace. And now, with no clear warrant and for no definable reason, everything was changed. More than changed, transformed. He felt that this was so, and yet was completely baffled by it. Words had not wrought the transformation, nor oratory, nor any trick of the voice, but some transcending Influence which breathed through all these things and made them its living vehicles.'

There was opposition, but Peter began well. He identified himself with the Salvation Army. 'Good luck to you, Sonny; God bless you,' the Assistant Editor said, 'and I wish I had half your pluck.' 'And now just see the subtle skill with which the Genius of Evil (make no mistake: he is a genius) exploits a perfectly natural sentiment. Peter, remember, had been a lonely child, and in spite of his years he wanted to be loved. He began by recognising his need of the love of God, and that was well. He gained the assurance of the love of God, and that was better. But he came to imagine that

the love of God was no more than his rightful reward, and that way lay disaster. He spoke in the open now because it flattered his vanity. He spoke at the indoor meetings because Tom Storm was certain to do so. He went to tea with Jim and his sons, because it showed what a Christian he was. But he scarcely prayed at all, and of service he had no conception.' Then there came a new Adjutant to Bristol, and he kept Peter in the background—no more starring as 'the converted reporter'; no more 'specialing.' Peter was unspeakably mortified and left the Army.

The years pass. Peter marries and has one little girl. He is steadied and softened but spiritually is 'nowhere.' But from time to time there are stirrings. Then 'one Sunday evening in the spring of 1927 Evensong was being broadcast from an Anglican church on the coast, and there was a virility in the voice of the officiating minister, so strongly in contrast with the usual clerical sing-song that Peter's attention was quickly aroused. . . . "Nobody knows what he may be doing if he prays for a friend to-night." Did some one pray for Peter; some one whom he had forgotten; some one who suddenly remembered him, or perhaps had been patient in prayer? There is no one to give the answer, but it is certain that while the words of the preacher were still in his ears, Peter began to be conscious of an irresistible influence. . . . The secrets of his selfish life were dragged to light, and they bowed him down till he ached with the burden of them. And all at once he knew that a Hand was held out to him; that here, undreamed of, unexplained, was God, and a chance of Heaven. . . . An extraordinary sense of lightness came to him; he felt a buoyancy, a gladness, a singing at the heart. . . . Dear God, the wonder of it! The loving wonder of it!'

Service.

'It was a day of heat and glare, and he was grateful for the shady coolness of long stone corridors. In company with an English nurse, he was making a tour of Kasr-el-Ainy, the great Cairo hospital where half the Orient studies medicine; and presently they came to a small square room with a glass door. Crouching on a rug was a little Egyptian

girl, ten or twelve years of age, a patient from one of the villages near the Pyramids. There was an angry scar on her left cheek, and this was the Mark of the Beast, for it was a jackal bite, and nothing in human knowledge could save her. The Pasteur treatment had been applied too late, and she was dying from hydrophobia. The nurse went upon her knees and took an orange from the pocket of her uniform. At sight of it the child made awful whimpering noises, like those of a sick puppy, but she peeled and divided it, and fed it, segment by juicy segment, into the thirsty little mouth. Every time she held the fruit forward the child snapped at it savagely; a slight misjudgment, the tiniest puncture of the skin, and death might come in a ghastly form. But the young Englishwoman never faltered, though she counselled Peter to keep his distance.'

Rapture.

'One day, in 1904, Mr. Ryosen Tsunajima, who had been ill with tuberculosis for over ten years, experienced this "seeing God" as he was returning from the bath. He did not see Him with his eyes, but he was made unspeakably happy. The road he was taking seemed to be lighted up with a halo of glory, which lasted for some minutes. This is seeing God—experiencing Him through a clear conscience. I have often had this experience; it is far above carnal satisfaction or pleasure in money-making. You feel so happy that you cannot keep still. How wonderful to be able to realize that God exists! When we think of the marvellous power which heals a body containing two billion cells, a feeling of awe comes over us, and uncontrollable tears of gratitude flow. Once when my eyes were very bad I woke up in the night and an inexpressible joy filled my soul. When I was poverty-stricken, realizing that God was providing food filled me with this rapture, time and again.'

¹ Hugh Redwood, *God in the Shadows*, 62.

² Toyohiko Kagawa, *New Life through God*, 167.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.